STACK
ACK AN
500
7690

TWENTY DISCOURSES

BY

EMIL G. HIRSCH

Rabbi Sinai Congregation, Chicago

CONTENTS:

1. The Jews and Jesus.
2. Jesus, His Life and Times.
3. The Doctrines of Jesus.
4. Paul, the Apostle of Heathen Judaism.
5. Why Am I a Jew? (I)
6. Why Am I a Jew? (II)
7. The Inalienable Duties of Man. (I)
8. The Inalienable Duties of Man. (II)
9. Myth, Miracle and Midrash.
10. The Bible in the Light of Modern Science.
11. The Place of the Individual in Organized Charity.
12. Some Tendencies of the Modern Drama.
13. Attacks on Jews and Judaism.
14. Judaism and the Higher Criticism.
15. The Doctrine of Evolution and Judaism.
16. Judaism and Modern Religion.
17. The God of Israel.
18. Concordance of Judaism and Americanism.
19. Responsibility for the Russian Massacres.
20. Reform Judaism and Unitarianism.

BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
NEW YORK

Stack
Annex
00 ENG
500
7690

The Jews and Jesus

A DISCOURSE
BY
EMIL G. HIRSCH

THE REFORM ADVOCATE
BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS
204 DEARBORN STREET. - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

5007690

The Reform Advocate

Published Weekly

In the Interest of Reform Judaism

DR. E. G. HIRSCH, Editor

With Contributions by the Ablest Jewish Writers

Subscription Price $2.00 Per Annum

Sample Copies Gratis

BLOCH & NEWMAN
Publishers

204 Dearborn St., Chicago

THE JEWS AND JESUS.

On might suppose that the Jew had been long enough before the world at large to be fully understood and to be justly estimated. But it seems that for many circling decades to come, the Jew will have to be resigned to the fate not to be kown, to figure as an archæological specimen for some kindly disposed persons, to serve as a target for poisoned arrows, drawn from the quiver of malevolent minds: in one word, forever to be misrepresented—not merely by such as close their eyes willingly to the brighter truth—but alas! even by others whose heart beats with rare loyalty to whatever is good, noble and uplifting. The books of all ages are witnesses to this sad lot, which has befallen the Jew. We cannot complain, therefore, that only in modern days this bitter tide has visited the son of Israel. What makes this experience in recent months more galling, is the contrast presented by the treatment accorded to the Jew, and the general drift of modern thought; is the disappointment keenly edged by the reflection that our hopes and expectations soar so high, while actual conduct still stilts in low planes. Whatever else may be said about the Jew and his religion, this one thing seems to be taken for granted, needing no further inspection or proof, that the Jew by his very religion, is led to be hostile to Christianity; that the Jewish heart bulges with hatred for all that is not labeled Jewish, and that especially he whose name for millions of

human beings tokens the very highest, is spurned and scorned with bitter contempt by the devoted descendants of Abraham, now as ever before. Nothing, however, can be further from the truth than this. Certainly the literature of Judaism ought to be taken into account before this sweeping verdict of condemnation is apodictically pronounced; and if there be those to whom the literature of Judaism is a sealed book, they should remember the canon of honesty that no one may speak of things of which, by the nature of their proclamation, he must be ignorant. It is a very comfortable but very cheap method with unperturbed self-assurance to repeat old errors, to voice old prejudices; but will an honest man indulge in these tactics? He will spurn to huckster in never so venerable prejudices unless convinced that their basis is the granite of fact, as revealed by an honest endeavor to probe things to the hard pan at the bottom. Those who have studied, or are competent to do so, the old Jewish literature, cannot with good conscience repeat the charge, that the Jew, by his very religion is prompted to cherish the spirit of hostility to all other religions. They cannot again lend word to the unjust though old indictment, that the Jew, rejecting the prophet of Nazareth, heaps upon this name, which is symbol of truth and emblem of love for millions, contempt and scorn.

Toward Christianity Judaism as a religion, even orthodox Judaism, has always preserved an attitude of kindliest fairness. Whatever laws may be found in the old rabbinnical codes bearing upon idolatry, atheism, blasphemy, and the whole ilk and brood of breaches of religious rectitude of this black order, Christianity was always officially and most emphatically declared not

to be one of the company of religious or rather irreligious systems to which the laws and regulations in question, enacted to stem the tide of idolatry and blasphemy, could apply. R. Joseph Caro is certainly a trustworthy exponent of Jewish orthodoxy of the most uncompromising stamp. In his "Beth-Joseph," a ritual code of high authority ('Hoshen Mishpat, 266), he says: "The non-Jews גוים of our days do not belong to the category denoted in the Talmud as 'Akkum' and none of the laws enacted against these is applicable to them." And his view and express statement has passed into the preface of well nigh all editions of the Shul'han-Arukh. Christianity is by Jewish orthodoxy, even, recognized to be a monotheistic religion. It is accorded willingly the function of having been among God's appointed agents to carry the light of monotheism out into the darkened world. Men who are at home in medieval Jewish literature need no longer assurance to quiet whatever apprehensions they might offhandedly have entertained on this score. Time will not allow us to give ear to more than a few voices composing the chorus, sounding in all centuries and countries the same glad song of tolerant recognition. Rabbi Jacob Emden, of Altona (1698-1776), puts the conception of the rabbis most pithily when he says: "Christianity was founded for the heathen, not as a new religion, but as the old, which commanded the keeping of the seven Noa'hidic (fundamental moral) laws, that had fallen into oblivion among the nations, and therefore were proclaimed anew by the Christian apostles." "The Christians," says another, R. Isaac ben Sheshet (1400-1440), "are to be considered as גרי תושב proselytes." These sentiments

and similar expressions abound in the writings of the old Jewish teachers. Every tyro in that field of learning is acquainted with this glorious abundance of testimony to similar purport.*

The Jews had no reason to love or to hate the founder of Christianity. They might have had provocation to hate those who pretended to be his followers; for the history of the Jews beginning with the Christian era clear down to this latest day, is but a succession of persecutions, such as no other set of human beings has been called upon to endure. No other religion was tried so sorely by another faith, her own daughter, officially at least professed by men in power. Talk of Asiatic brutality; of African barbarism! Why, what the savage tribes commit in their rude ignorance is kindness compared to what was practiced upon the Jews! Need I go into details? Scarce a year passed from the third Christian century to the French Revolution, but somewhere in Europe, in the very name of Christianity, Jews were slaughtered by the thousands. Innocence is no protection; weakness is no armor; wisdom affords no escape; old age does not stay the hand that would strike! With fire and dungeon; with rack and torture, they come,—the pretended apostles of a religion of love! Alas, the provocation to hate was ample; but nevertheless Christianity was not hated! Hatred must be made of sterner stuff than the estimate of Christianity's providential mission which again and again finds place in the books of rabbinical writers! Is it hatred that prompted one, *f. i.*, to say: "The founder of Chris-

*Hamburger's Encyclopedia, Suppl. II, under the caption, "Christen," has collected most of the passages in this roll of honor.

tianity has conferred a twofold benefaction upon the world; on the one hand, he emphasized the eternal obligation of the law of Moses, on the other he led the heathen from idolatry to the knowledge of the (seven) laws of morality"? The Jews in the middle ages would gladly have refrained from discussing Christianity, had they been permitted so to do. The silence about Jesus in the Talmud is significant. Few are the personal references to him, though in an indirect manner the doctors of the Talmud show that they are, to a certain extent, acquainted with his labors, as related in the traditions, probably not yet rigidly crystalized, of his followers. Under the cover of Balaam's name, they assign to him a prophetic mission. Controversies, indeed, are recorded with the adherents of the rising new sect. But these run not along the line of Jesus's personality but of dogmatic differences or of the correct interpretation of Biblical passages. A broad tolerance marks even Talmudical polemics. In post-Talmudic centuries, the Jews enter the lists only as forced combatants. Bishops and prelates, kings and counts cited the Jewish scholars to dangerous disputations. In defense, not in defiance, do the rabbis take part in the combat. They are not the assailants, but always the assailed! That they should take advantage of all resources of logic or learning, none will reckon to their blame. The controversies turn largely on so-called Messianic prophecies. No wonder, then, that also the commentators on the passages where Jewish interpretants took their own counsel and differed radically from the constructions of the Christian, should have embraced the opportunity to speak somewhat at length on the points in issue. Nor is it surprising that Jew-

ish thinkers in treating of doctrinal chapters have, in defining the position of Judaism, occasionally made excursions into the domain of Christian theology. But, for the most part, this is done in a spirit of reserve and becoming dignity. As far as I know, the name of the founder of Christianity is but rarely mentioned by the Jewish debaters and writers. And where it is, it is without any manifestation of what might be misconstrued into contempt or scorn, though, of course, the absence of any peculiar reverence is also noticeable. Jesus is generally cited as הנוצרי the "Nazarene." A certain familiarity with the New Testament is also displayed on the part of some, if not all, Jewish controvertants. Whatever there may have been of bitterness in these compulsory polemics was caused by the Jewish apostates. These worthies, then as now, deemed it rare sport to "cast stones into the very well from which they had drunk." Often blatant ignoramuses, always dishonest self-seekers, they had no compunction to twist into nets and snares for Judaism and the Jews the garbled or disfigured knowledge they possessed of the faith of their fathers. These foul knaves, the rabbis were called to meet. They would have been superhuman had they altogether suppressed the rising indignation at this insult added to injury. There is, however, one black exception to this unbroken rule of dignified controversy, so far as the Jews had a share in it. Some time before the 9th century, further than this the date cannot be determined, appeared a pasquille of the vilest sort, "Tol'doth Jeshu" (Life of Jesus), purporting to give the story of the great Nazarene. Its original language was probably the aramæan, and Syria may have been the home of the author. This Apocryphon

is a cesspool of all nastiness, of fabrications out of the whole cloth; the responsibility for it Judaism declines to shoulder, as its sentiments are not now, and never were, shared by the Jews.

It stands to reason that with the birth of modern science and new investigations in the domain of religious thought, history and literature, the attention of Jewish scholars was no less attracted to nascent Christianity than was that of non-Jewish students.

Before there was a call for Jewish historians to deal with the life and the character of the carpenter's son of Bethlehem, historical studies had first to make their influences felt in and out of Judaism. It is merely in modern time that the comparative science of religion has been ushered into blessed utility. Only within the last sixty years have scholars found themselves moved to trace back the course of religious development, and to peep if possible into the laboratory of history, whence those peculiar forces are sent forth on their errand, which we spell by the name of this or that religious movement. Only within the last sixty or seventy years, or perhaps we may go as far back as Lessing, was there any occasion to search into the part or function played by the great personalities whose names are thundering down the vestibules of time, in that great ocean styled by us, growing, moving, striving humanity. Before the method of these studies and their relation to the growth of ideas, potent in human evolution, had been discovered, there was no occasion for the Jewish thinker to devote time and attention to the life and the character of the founder of a religion not his own. Certainly the thinkers of the middle ages could not be attracted to go into this field by the promise of finding there a sweet

grain which did not wave in their home acres. The contrast was pressed upon them most painfully, that if what Christianity presented to the Jew was love, the law of the Jews was much better than the thus pretended higher revelation. The Jew must have possessed at home whatever he needed to make life sweet. Say what you will of the Judaism of the middle ages, call it narrow, deride it as superstitious, denounce it as slavery to form, unless lost to all sense of justice, or without the power to dive beneath the surface of the seeming, to the roots of the real, you cannot but witness to the incontrovertible fact that for sweetness and spirituality of life, the Jew of the Ghetto, the Jew of the middle ages, the Jew under the yoke of the Talmud, challenges the whole world. No life is sweeter and at the same time stronger than theirs. In their home glowed the chaste flame of love; in their heart leaped upward the blaze of aspiration. Talk of martyrdom! It has become fashionable for the liberal platform lecturers to make much of the story of the great heroes who died for the intellectual freedom of the world, beginning with Socrates and Jesus; through the darker ages to the dawn of the Reformation, and enumerating the many stars whose light went out in the blaze of the funeral pyre, or whose life blood oozed away under the executioner's axe, they finally wind up with a special eclat with Spinoza, that victim of the intense bigotry, as our liberal platform lecturers would have it, which nowhere else but in the narrow synagogue could have asserted itself. Certainly, the memory of these is hallowed forever! But for martyrdom and devotion to principle the lot of the Jew and his fortitude are to the fate and steadfastness of Socrates and Spinoza, a

crown diamond compared to the paste imitation on the ring of a low, vulgar gambler. No other record of heroism for principle's sake is so bright and inspiring as are the tear-stained scrolls, the "Memoir Books," chronicling the slaughter of the Jews in the middle ages. Heroism of this kind is spiritual in the highest degree; and therefore for the spirit's chastening or sweetening influence the Jew found no necessity to go beyond his own religious temple, and to look for example beyond his own religious community. A religion that could make life worth living, with its hopes deferred and its duties redoubled, under such distressing circumstances, was religion strong and sweet enough. Its adherents had no need to hunger for bread other than their own teaching. What they needed was provided in the synagogue and within the walls of their own contracted home. Yea, their home was filled with a peace which the world could not give, and which the world could not take away.

Only in modern times, when scholars began to investigate the processes which resulted in these grand movements, the positive religions of modern day, did also Jewish scholars waken to the profitableness of devoting thought and time to the life, the labors and the character of the prophet of Nazareth. Not merely we, the liberals, have willingly accepted the invitation to study that chapter of our history, which more than any other has affected civilization, but the more conservative, yea, even the orthodox, have with equal zeal, and with total absence of prejudice, investigated these portentous days, when, according to common tradition, Jesus taught in the synagogues of Galilee, and died at Golgotha, a victim of Roman politics and of priestly

intrigue. All of us are agreed, waving even the question of the historical authenticity of the gospels, that Jesus was a noble character; that in him quivered the fullest measure of spirituality; that he believed in his own destiny and duty; that he taught a high life. But all of us are also agreed in this: that what he taught was not a revelation new to the synagogues; for neither in his morality nor in his religious hope did he advance one step beyond the teachings of contemporaneous Judaism.

He cannot lay claim to originality; what he teaches is the echo of the doctrines he himself had heard from the lips of his own Jewish masters; what lived and moved and stirred in him, that lived as fully in the hearts of many others in those days. He was distinguished for his love for the common people; in him beat a heart attuned to the higher possibilities of the human kind. For him religion was not altogether form and ceremony; it was devotion and duty. But for all this, he did not stand on a higher altitude than did the teachers of his own days, teachers in the synagogue; teachers that never dreamed, as indeed he never did dream, to hold a commission from on high to bring to the world a new light. We grant, for argument's sake, that he lived and labored during the critical period to which the gospels assign him,—though this has been doubted;—we take, without further inquiry, the statements of the gospels as they are. With these data a conclusion is forced upon one in the least familiar with the Jewish thought of that time, that in what and how he taught and prayed, in his hopes and his illusions, —in no particular did he set himself in opposition to the synagogues of his day. Nor did he rise to a higher

plane of religious uplook than had risen many of his predecessors; many of those among whom he lived. The Lord's Prayer is indeed a wreath of the most beautiful flowers of the Jewish liturgy. It has become the most powerful inspiration of all times. But in that casket, containing so many jewels, there is not a single gem but had graced in one form or other the crown worn by the synagogue. Some, even professional liberal lecturers, in season and out of season, tell their admiring friends—and strange to say, among these the Jews predominate—that such a thought as "Our Father which art in Heaven," could never have crossed the lips of a Jew, bound in the fetters of the Judaism of this or any other age,—yea, the Judaism of our day not excepted. It is true the Christian theological seminaries never weary of teaching this fallacy. Probably these liberal lecturers, notwithstanding their profuse profession to have overcome the limitations of their early Presbyterian education, have remained derelict to the ethical duty to revise their stock of information carried away from school. And thus, with an assurance that among Jews would be characterized by the word יוצפה they repeat in season and out of season, the slander that Judaism can never unseal the lips of its devotees to stammer forth the sublime, the inspiring invocation, "Our Father which art in Heaven." It is a pity, indeed, that historical truth compels us to spoil these ethical lecturers' stock in trade. There is not an old Siddur, an old prayer-book but has this very appeal to God, אבינו שבשמים "Our Father which art in Heaven"; and the Jewish prayers which begin in this wise are not posterior to the period when the Lord's Prayer became known; if anything, they precede in

time the composition and the promulgation of the New Testament formula.

Judaism then has not learned the thought, "Our Father which art in Heaven," from the mouth of Jesus, but Jesus learned it from the lips of Judaism. "Ah!" says now the ethical lecturer, and those that make a parade of their liberalism, either ignorant of the facts in point or willingly blind to them, "Our Father which art in Heaven, in the petition of the Jew, signifies the father of the Jews; no one else is God's son except the Jew." Again, in urging this error in the defense of his first, the former Presbyterian clergyman reveals that though he may have been a student at the theological seminary, he has never grasped his Old Testament—a collection of writings which certainly a clergyman and a liberal lecturer without question should have read. Did not one of the later prophets living at least four hundred or five hundred years before Chrstianity call out: "Have we not all one Father? Has not one God made us all?" Are there not in this old Bible, psalms of the broadest fellowship, or books which breathe the fire of indignant protest against the thought that God was merely the God of the Israelites; that God had no care for the strangers, or love for members of other nationalities? No; whatever may be said about Jewish exclusivity and national pride, the charge must be dismissed for want of evidence, while Judaism can easily prove her case. Her genius is toward universal fellowship. Jewish universalism is quick at all times; is quick even in Talmudic Judaism; quick in the Judaism of today. Long before the great teacher of Nazareth went out to clothe in sound the thought of the universal fatherhood, had Judaism conceived of it;

taught it at home; had proclaimed it to the whole world. "Our Father which art in Heaven," whatever construction may be put upon the phrase, is bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. The appeal was not new for us, no new revelation for the synagogue, however new it may have been for the non-Jewish world.

It has been urged that Jesus proclaimed himself "the son of man" in distinction to those who continued to call themselves sons of Abraham, sons of Judah, sons of Hellas, sons of Rome. The critical student, both of the biography of Jesus and of the old Jewish records, must shake his head in pity for the ignorance, or in anger for the presumption of those that would trestle on such weak supports their airy constructions. If it must be accepted, for the moment let us accept it—that the phrase "son of man," has this point: Jesus is cosmopolitan; he has risen above the narrow limitations of nationality and locality, race and blood; again, our old Bible, our old Testament, by six hundred years is his predecessor, in bringing this thought to a focus. Does not Ezekiel, the prophet of the approaching restoration, the priest drafting the plan of the temple about to be rebuilt, and of the priesthood to be reorganized, call himself בן אנש son of man? If this title tokens universality, Ezekiel assuming it is entitled to the priority by many generations. At all events this universal thought is not an exotic flower in Judaism. On the other hand, however, it cannot be urged that Jesus in using the title "son of man," had at all in mind this universalism. For the very Jesus who is now set up as a type of the man of universal sympathies, cautions his own disciples not to preach the word to non-Israelites. He does not travel in Samaria, because

Samaria is defiled. He warns against throwing the bread to the strangers. He would have it divided among the children of his own people. He talks about casting "pearls before swine"—meaning thereby the non-Jews. Whatever construction we may place upon the title "son of man" we are confronted by the dilemma either to grant that before Jesus's time the title and therefore its implication was assumed by one of our own prophets or that even Jesus was prejudiced—shared all the old national prejudices of his kinsmen. The gospels, purporting to report his sayings, make him out to be a Jew, national to the core, national in his sympathies; proclaiming his doctrines to the Jews and the Jews alone; delighting in being the shepherd of Israel, and not of the lost sheep of other flocks.

But our philological conscience cannot but register its protest against urging the title "son of man" to mean, son of all humanity. The phrase is Aramaic. In the Hebrew of Ezekiel which begins to take an Aramaic coloring, it occurs as well. Both in Hebrew בן אנש and in Aramaic ב־נש it cannot be construed to mean aught but simply human being. Jesus speaks of himself as the "son of man," if any protest was in his thought, it would have been none other than against the imputation of divinity to him. He is the simple "man." In reality the gospels follow consciously in this, as in many more points, the precedent of the Hebrew scriptures. Because Ezekiel was so denoted, the writers of the New Testament use the phrase to describe Jesus. The compounds with בר in Aramaic are in sense mere adjectives. "Son of Man" is in English radically at variance with the sense of the Hebrew בן אנש or the Aramaic ברנש The Hebrew phrase, with the word son, and the similar

Aramaic construction, are idiomatic expressions. In English and in other modern tongues, and in Latin and Greek we should employ adjectives. "Son of man" in Hebrew conveys to one familiar with the genius of the language the notion of our English "human." Thus if that phrase has any bearing other than literal, its force lies in the humanity, in contradistinction to the divinity, of Jesus.

But the morality of Jesus is perhaps broader than that of the synagogue! Certainly no one before Jesus has said—says our liberal lecturer of the Ethical Culture Society, the liberal preacher of the Unitarians, and others,—no one in the synagogue ever could have said, "Love thy neighbor like thyself;" "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Did none before Jesus preach this altruism? Can we overlook Confucius? But of Confucius the Jews knew nothing at that time. Were the Jews then ignorant of the principle? The book of Tobit was composed about three hundred years before the Christian era; it contains the "golden rule." Is it then taken from the New Testament? The book in which it is found is older than the New Testament, the conclusion which is the original is not difficult to draw. Moreover our own Hillel, summed up his religion in this epitome of ethics: "Love thy neighbor like thyself." "What is hateful to thee do not do to thy fellow." "This is Judaism, all the rest is commentary," said he to the heathen, come to be converted, זה כלל גדול שבתורה this was the fundamental proprosition of the law. "Go and study the commentary!" Whose now is the priority, Hillel's or Jesus's? Consult the tables of chronology! Judaism as conceived of by Hillel had on this point nothing to learn

from Jesus. But "Judaism never loved the enemy; never was it said by them of old, 'Love your enemy.'" Perhaps not in so many words! But was this precept ever practiced by the Christians? Exclusion is certainly a strange demonstration of one's love. Exclusion of the descendants of fathers falsely charged with a crime which they never had committed, from political life and civil rights, ostracism from society, refusal of hospitality at public inns,—these are indeed symptoms of a love so strange as to pass all understanding. And then they talk of love to their enemies, when they cannot even love those who are not their enemies! It seems, then, that the Christians no less than others have not been very attentive to the words of Jesus. Let the Christians first learn and practise the doctrines of the Mount, before in blindness superinduced by a beam in their own eye, they would reproach others for the mote in theirs! As a matter of fact, however, the Jews have practiced this "love" for the enemy, and have abhorred "hatred." Not in a spirit of boastfulness do I say this. You know that I protest against this spirit of boastfulness, in season and out of season, perhaps more strongly than is to your liking. Justice, however, warrants the claim. the Jews did love those that hated them and were taught to return good for evil. In the Jewish law, it is said that if enemy and friend need the helping hand, the enemy shall be the first, not the friend, to receive aid. Such is Jewish, Talmudic ethics. Is it then a departure from the truth, to hold that Judaism recognizes the precept, "Thou shalt love thine enemy?" Was it not a principle of the synagogues? The Jews certainly have practiced it. Where was ever Jew whose philanthropy was not broader than race or creed lines? Our

hospitals and training schools are open to all alike. Is the Christian civilization under the Czar's benevolent sceptre an illustration of Christian love? Was it love that made homeless millions of human beings who happened to be of one race with the Nazarene? Is it love that confines as many more to a territory where there is no room for them to live but must rot and die of slow starvation? And our United States Government is willing to do detective work for this organized barbarism, that not content to have thousands in the Siberian mines, upon whom to vent a superabundance of love, is yearning to stretch forth its arms across the ocean in search for other victims of its attachment. When the Czar's name is mentioned at the banquets we rise to do him honor, this despot of Asiatic power. But let a Jewish American venture to plan a visit to this our "friend's" dominion. At the frontier he is told he must stay out. And indeed, who would not be glad to stay out of that hell, that house of bondage! Yet our United States Senator would return thither all whose only offence is to have forged a paper which alone gave them the privilege to get out under the wings of the Russian majesty's paternal care!

We are not enemies of Russia; but in this way we are treated. Contrast Russian love with our Jewish hatred. Had we, to learn the lesson of love, to scan the New Testament! It seems those that profess to be sworn interpreters of the New Testament have not learned it. But the Jews with nothing but the Old Testament and the Talmud seem practically to have applied love as the law that binds us, nay, the vaster family of humanity.

The other principles too, in which the ethics of Jesus are said to be different from ours have never yet been

practically carried out anywhere on earth. Why have the machinery of courts when according to the ethics of New Testament Christianity the murderer should not be punished; the thief should be encouraged; the man that strikes one blow should be asked to strike a second? We have the teacher's own word to this effect. No quibble can lift us over this hard and fast fact. The ethics of Jesus teach non-resistance. Early Christianity reflects a communistic form of society. "Sell all that thou hast and follow me!" is the answer given by Jesus to the rich young man anxious to join his band of disciples. In his kingdom, as he foresaw it, there was no need of money; there was need for love. The early Christians lived in communistic organizations and associations. This is a matter of historical record. The boast of many, indeed, is that they live in accordance with the Sermon on the Mount, their boast is not verified by their actions. The so-called disciples of Christ have not accepted these social doctrines; they have not lived by them, and we have not either more or less than they, but *we* never claimed to have accepted as of divine origin those social principles.

But why, if Jesus was so truly at one with the spiritual elements of Judaism—why was he crucified? To state the matter in brief. the Jews as a whole did not sympathize with his executioners and were not responsible for that crime. Among the Jews there was but one faction that conspired with the Romans to silence this tongue that spoke the message of hope to the downtrodden and enslaved. That small faction was not as you might suppose recruited from the Pharisees. Jesus probably belonged to no party. Men of genius do not wear the uniform of any party; they are a party in

themselves; a power in their own self-centered individuality. But the Pharisees had no reason to be dissatisfied with him. Whatever he lays down in his interpretations of the law is sound pharisaical doctrine. To break the Sabbath for the sake of saving life is a positive command of the Pharisee not a new view and a larger liberty Christianity brought about through Jesus and his disciples. We Jews have certainly learned the old (Jewish) truth: The Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath. Our official Christianity, however, needs again a Jesus to recall this vital thought to its memory. But the rich among the Jews, the Sadducees, the high priestly family, with whose monopoly to sell at high prices the sacrificial beasts in the Temple and to exchange at usurious rates the foreign coins for the home shekels that could only be accepted in the Temple—these usurers and gamblers in holy things had found in Jesus one who with whip scourged their wretched agents from the Temple. These conspired with their friend Pontius Pilate to put an end to this man that had become so exceedingly inconvenient to them. Such saints there are to be found at all times, in all sects. To-day yet there are denominations who will not have their preachers interfere with their trusts and monopolies. To-day there are Jews who would crucify their rabbi, who dares to call out in protest against gambling and money tyranny of whatever kind. To-day there are those of whatever nation, who call for the police and the army whenever the preacher presumes to sound the warning that "things are rotten in Denmark," and pricks the gaudy bubble of deceptive peace which is internecine war. To-day they would nail to the cross him who cautions to beware of a peace which arrests

progress. They would silence him who would tell them that theirs is the power to change things peacefully, but if the opportunity be lost, the change will come about in the storm of destruction and by the rod of disaster. Small wonder then, that in Jerusalem, those who writhed under the lash in their rude brutality called upon the Roman general to aid them to silence this rebel; in the eyes of the Romans, Jesus was a rebel. He preached the kingdom come.

What did kingdom come mean? Did it point to a kingdom beyond the clouds? It meant liberty for Judaism; restoration of national independence. It meant the driving out of the Romans from the sacred territory. This terrible import the Messianic message had indeed when a few decades later the Jews rose up against the Romans, and in despair struggled two years for their freedom, to be disappointed in defeat, and to be exterminated as a nation forever. Kingdom come, then, was the crying watchword against the Roman. The Roman procurator and the Jewish high priest conspired against him, and without due process of law—I repeat the statement—without due process of law, put to death him who was the mouthpiece of the down-trodden, who had trumpeted forth the hope of his people. The Jews did not reject him. What he brought was their own; what he taught was their own inspiration. But the Pharisees, in the common sense of the word, not in the true sense of the word—the hypocrites, the wealthy, the priests, and the Roman governor, silenced forever that man gifted with eloquence such as had come to few men.

Jesus was indeed one of those rare men that from time to time visit earth, sounding with greater emphasis thoughts that had been promulgated before. I have

said—and Geiger already has raised this point in controversy with Renan and others—that there is no originality in Jesus's doctrines. As a matter of content there is not; for whatever he treats of, has been treated of before. But as a matter of expression, putting the matter so as to vest it with the force of almost a new thought, Jesus—or whoever wrote the New Testament—commands a place among the few chosen of God. The rough diamond he cut and ground so that new light from every facet was sent forth into the astonished world. His words have the stamp of great genius; not so much for what they say, as for the manner in which they are put forth. To the non-Jewish world, even the thought was new; and through Jesus the non-Jewish world learned a new hope, and was led to new heights. Jesus, also, by the light of historical studies, must be credited with a warm heart for the common people. In the Judaism of those days there were three sects. First the Pharisees, the aristocracy of learning despising the ignorant. And one cannot sometimes help sharing or pardoning their contempt for ignorance. Whoever had to deal with presumptuous ignorance, will at times be sorely tempted to harbor the same feeling as the old Pharisees had: that learning is, after all, a privilege which Nabob and Moneybag with all their wealth and resources can never pre-empt; that in the sale of humanity, the mind well cultured weighs much more than the pocket well filled.

The Pharisees were the sect of the learned men, an aristocracy of scholarship; the Sadduccees were an aristocracy of birth, for they were the priests. To their ranks was never admitted one not born of priestly parents. They, of course, despised the common people. The

Essenes, the third but small sect, living under communistic rules, were politically indifferent. Men affecting outward purity by their dress, they shunned certainly the touch of the common people, for the very hem of the garment of an outsider might defile them.

The common people were thus despised by Pharisee, Sadducee and Essene. But the prophet of Nazareth loved the common people, עמי הארץ He associated with the outcasts of society The guests at his table were the publicans and sinners, the lost, often abandoned women. He mingled with the common people; he spoke to them; his disciples were of the common people. He did not think that learning was a crown or that birth did confer a diadem; that outward purity alone gave entrance to kingdom come. But he believed that inward spirituality, and that found among all classes of people, crowned with a tiara studded with jewels more costly than priestly diadem or laurel wreath of learning, or rough woven garment of outward purity. Among the common people he worked and labored; his every thought was consecrated to them; and no wonder that his name to-day yet is the emblem of hope for the down-trodden and the oppressed of all the world.

He belongs to us. Not that we need to go to his books for so-called new thought; not that we need to turn to his life even for inspiration; for the Jew for fifteen centuries has often had to toil up Golgotha's steep and heavy ascent. We bore a cross the weight of which was a thousandfold heavier than that which Jesus carried to the place of his execution. The thorny crown; who wears it? The Jew to-day; the Jew yesterday. He will wear it yet to-morrow. We are prepared for new torture; we who know what it is to be a Jew. The lash;

who felt it? Not Jesus alone. Innumerable are those of his kinsmen that felt the lash; who feel it to-day. The gibe and jeer who has heard them? The Jew. Who has displayed steadfastness? Not merely Jesus prayed: "Not my will but thy will;" the Jew it was who faltered not, because he knew that reservoir of moral force: "Not my will, O God, but thy will:" yea, what but this, has been the sigh and the stay of millions of Jews these fifteen hundred years of tears and torment? Who died with the prayer on the lip: "Father forgive them, they know not what they are doing?" Jesus. Who lives with the prayer on the lip? The Jew. "Father forgive them, they know not what they are doing," is the poem written in the stanzas of suffering by the Jews on thousands and hundreds of thousands of agonizing hearts. Steadfastness in the belief in his own destiny and duty exemplified in the life of Jesus! Yes, nobly so! "If it be thy will that this cup shall pass away;" his prayer in the awful night of Gethsemane. "If it be thy will that this cup pass away," is the prayer of the Jews; has been; is now. But steadfast they remained; they die, if it must be; they live—if it be God's pleasure—for principle's sake. So, what for the outer world was tokened by that one life, millions of lives have emblazoned upon our souls. We needed not higher inspiriation; we had it at home; he was the reflection of Jewish inner life for which the world had waited. He became its anchor and mooring. But it was Judaism that sent out this torch-bearer to light up the inky darkness. No; not merely the liberal Jew, but every Jew who knows his own history will gladly so rank the teacher of Nazareth. No. For ignorance we Jews are

not responsible. For the rantings and ravings of a penny-a-liner on one of the daily journals of this city we are not responsible. I will venture to say there was never a Jew in Chicago that objected to what was said from this pulpit about Jesus, the report to the contrary was gotten up to make a sensation. Anything to make a sensation. In dull times, head lines printed in big letters about "a storm in the camp of Israel raised by remarks on Jesus" attract attention. But if storm there was, it was a storm in a teakettle, and I doubt whether any Jew with any pretention to culture, objected then or objects now to the picture of Jesus's character as drawn on this platform. The Jew, of whatever shade of opinion, is willing to acknowledge the charm, the beauty, the whole-souled perfection of the great prophet of Nazareth. He belongs to us; we have not rejected him. The dream of humanity is ours. The gates of this temple are open to all. Any one may join us; we ask no questions. There is no platform, no movement, so broad as this Jewish movement. But why should we give up what we have had and have for the mere sake of making a demonstration of our liberality? History has not yet run to the end. The full pattern of God is not off the loom. The signs are not for tearing down the walls; the gates are open; we are ready to receive. Shall we step out as long as we are driven back and refused the welcome? If Jesus were to come back to earth to-day they, the Christians would not admit him to their clubs because he is a Jew; if St. Paul were to come to life he would not be received; St. Peter would not be allowed to guest at a summer hotel, because, forsooth, he is a Hebrew. And therefore the

synagogue must continue to exist if for no other reason, than to give Jesus a home.

Many among us deplore the existence of Judaism. Born of a Jewish mother they grieve at the fatality of their pedigree. They would be free. They disclaim Jewish religious sympathies. "No rabbi for them!" They are kind enough to contribute to his support. But out of pure pity! These race Jews indeed deserve the rebuffs the world has ready for all Jews. Let them be rejected by European courts or American clubs, we have no tear of sympathy to waste on them. Theirs is a just reminder, that though they would not share Judaism's blessings with us, they bear our common lot. For them it is a gnawing shame; for us a glorious pride. For the true Jew never despairs of the ultimate victory of light over darkness. The time will come when better Christians than now reject, will welcome the better Jews, yea, better than they who now would desert the post of danger, though of duty and honor. The walls then will fall. But in the new temple of humanity, a niche will also be consecrated to the lowly Jew of Nazareth, one of that people called to the hero's, the martyr's crown. A Jew was Jesus, as faithful a Jew as ever drew breath, and *as such* not in opposition to his Judaism, is he the type of a noble-hearted man! Amen.

PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF HEATHEN JUDAISM, OR CHRISTIANITY.

Jesus founded no new religion; he formulated no new theology; he proclaimed no new creed. He preached repentance and promised the kingdom of Heaven; his instructions were pregnant with richest ethical thought. The Sermon on the Mount is undoubtedly the most abundant casket of jewels drawn from the treasure house of high moral inspiration. There is no other necklace so valuable as this; the world has prized it; and as long as suns will rise and moons will wax and wane in the nightly sky, as long as man has not lost that appreciation for purity which is the best heirloom given to him, these words of Jesus will come to the soul as the whispered proclamation of the highest. A greater contrast cannot well be conceived, than that presented by the official literature of the church three hundred, and two hundred years after Jesus' time, to his own—if his own they were—words and appeals. Prof. Hatch, in his Hibbert Lectures on the Influence of Greek Thought upon the Development of Christianity, calls attention especially to this contrast. Christianity, says he, begins with ethics: its passion is kindled by immorality; its anger is aroused by unrighteousness; its hopes center in the establishment of a kingdom of justice, and the path, narrow and

steep, to salvation runs along the heights of moral endeavor and moral uplook. The official church, on the other hand, is anchored to a creed; belief is essential, practice is held under contempt; and as the impulse to creed grows stronger with the circling years, conduct and character are considered to be mere dross—worthless chaff to be carried away by the wind; while faith, and faith alone is proclaimed to be the key wherewith to unlock the gateway of the hereafter, open only to those that accept, and closed to all others—be it through ignorance or be it through perversion—that do not accept the fundamental dogma.

Who is responsible for this utter change of attitude? Greek thought and Greek philosophy have dug this new channel, along which the waters welling from the Pools of Siloah ran along with ever more sluggish pace, while they might have flowed, had they been permitted to obey their own original roadbed, in limpid, crystal purity. Their enforced indolence made them an easy prey to the fickle sand sweeping down upon them from the banks of the new excavation, and threatened to throttle them in a swamp of their own making. The focus, so to speak, in which sunlight from Palestine's hills and thought waves from Athen's acropolis met, was the mind of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. No man has affected the destiny of our family so deeply and so permanently as has this tent-maker of Tarsus. Speak of the mighty heroes on battle field and in battle heat unmoved, who thundered forth, over legions too numerous to be counted, the word of advance; speak of the heroes of peace that spend their days in the search after truth, mounting the weary steps leading to the watch-tower of the night, to communicate with the

stars above, or descending into the very bowels of the earth to read the stony inscriptions treasuring the very records of our earth's creation; speak of those heroes of the mind that impatient of fragmentary knowledge, at personal sacrifice of time and treasure, sally forth into untrodden territories and brave the darts of the fever and the poisoned arrows of the hostile savages in their quest after information; speak of the giants of industry that link together distant zones by ligatures of iron and steel; or surgeons that cut the umbilical cord binding daughter island to mother continent. None of these has so materially, so deeply, so lastingly stamped his own thought upon the human race as has, and does to the present day, the poor, misshapen Jew, Roman citizen though he was, whose cradle stood at Tarsus and whose school years were spent at the feet of Jerusalem's patriarchs. Should ever, by some hap or other, the greatest lights be extinguished in the galaxy spanning the centuries, longer than any other star would scintillate above in power his name. Yea, none has so deeply, I repeat, affected the destiny of the human family as has Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles. On his account wars were waged; by his doctrine humanity was cleft into hostile camps; his words have been the burden of many a human soul and again have been the stay of as many other human hearts. He has cited the demons of terror to gather around the bed where agonized poor human mortal clay in terror and anxiety of what would come after the final struggle of life; and he has winged with confidence of peaceful hope and assurance other souls impatient to shuffle off this mortal coil and to enter the truer kingdom of light, of love and of life. Whatever our own religious opinions may be, this fact

alone should assure for his words and his doctrines a careful and a close attention.

We cannot understand Paul without first comprehending the peculiar change wrought by the contact of Jewish thought with Greek doctrines before his coming, which resulted in a certain phase of Judaism. Paul would be an impossibility, original as he is, without Philo before him, without Alexandrian Judaism as the mother well for him to drink from. Even the most original minds are linked to their antecedents; none—unless it be in modern time, where originality is as cheap as the mud in our city streets—none is self-made in the work shop where thought spins its eternal threads. What the best, what the brightest of our kind may hope to accomplish is to weave a new design into the pattern, but the threads which we employ and which we cast backward and forward with the flying shuttle are taken from the bobbin on which are wound the reflections of the men who lived before us. There is historical continuity and, therefore, historical connectedness in the evolution of thought. We stand on our past, and so did Paul rise to his giant stature on the shoulders of those that preceded him. When Jew came first in contact with Greek, a new opportunity opened for him. No greater distance can possibly be imagined between two poles of thought than is that which gapes between Greek and Jewish mind. The Greek is typically Aryan, as such it inclines to analysis, the Jewish to synthesis; the Greek scales to truth by the round of details; the Jew soars to truth by the energy of sentiment and feeling; the Jew is intensely personal, the Greek is as intensely abstract; the Jew reads world and nature in terms of an equation of personality in

which the two factors are rigidly kept apart; the original Semitic God is indeed living alone beyond the world; he governs the world, but he is not immanent in it. The original Semitic God idea has been preserved in the Koran, or perhaps I had better say carried therein to its furthest consistency. God and man are separated, and the cleavage between them is as impassable as is a gulch cut by the water courses in a rugged mountain. Even later Mohammedan theology and philosophy were unable to span that chasm with a bridge steady and secure. This Semitic God idea is modified, of course, in the theology of the prophets; but taking it as a whole it remains unshakably true, that Mohammed, and not Spinoza, is strikingly Semitic.

Universe and God are two divided poles for the Semite, while the Greek rather views them as one, differentiated under two aspects. The difficulty for Jew and Greek to understand each other was not the result of difference of language alone. The Greek could not conceive of an extra-mundane God; the gods of the Greeks lived in the world; they did not merely send forth the storms their messengers and command the lightning to run on their swift errands; they did not merely bid the waters stand still, or the sea to rise in wrath—the gods were the water, the gods were the winds. God was immanent, not transcendental.

But Jew and Greek a few centuries before Paul had come into closer communion. Alexander the Great, in his ambition to found a world empire, had mixed the ingredients of a new humanity with the pestle of war. Stamping and grinding humanity in the mortar he forced into closest contact Greek and Jew. In consequence of this, arose the necessity for the Jewish

thinkers in Alexandria to present their to the Greek utterly inconceivable system, in a form that might bring it nearer to the understanding of the Greek mind. Certain concepts found even in certain books of their old Hebrew Bible, stood them in good stead for this purpose. The so-called wisdom literature, in itself free from national bias and therefore more readily appealing to the sympathies of the Hellenized Jews of Egypt, proved the suggestive source of mediating thoughts; for in these books wisdom appears almost in the light of an independent essence under God through which the world is guided. On the other hand, as they became more familiar with Greek thought, they found something analogous to this in Plato's system. Greek philosophy had evolved the poetic notion, that God in creating the world had conceived first in his own mind the perfect universe; actual creation was merely clothing with visible reality the idea which had taken life and shape in the mind of the Creator. Platonism, or to be more accurate, Neo-Platonism reigned supreme in the academies of Alexandria. The view that God had associated with him a second energy, the ideas through which he acted upon the world, lay ready to hand. The abstract God in his sublime majesty was out of nexus with the universe; he had deputized the ideas to act in his behalf. The Jewish mind and the Greek had thus apparently come to the same conclusion. The Jewish current had reflected divine wisdom as the potency of creation; the Greek had emphasized a similar view, that God's ideas are the principles by which the world is called into being. Here was now promise of reconciliation; the two lines of thought had this point in common. Here they intersected. Idea and

"Chokhmah" are the *logos,* divine reason, the mediator which the Greek mind needed to link world to God and man to his supreme creator. It is a Jewish thinker, Philo, contemporaneous with Jesus, who systematizes this peculiar view of the universe. God creates the world through *logos;* God acts on the world through *logos.* In Philo, it is not clear whether *logos* be merely a hypostasis, projection of God himself, or it be a second personality of God himself. At all events, Philonism had thoroughly prepared the soil for the planting of the seed from which Paulinian theology could grow. From Philo it was but one step to Paul's dogma. The fourth gospel, whatever the age of its composition, before or after the epistles, is the echo of Hellenistic Alexandrian speculations. It identifies Christ with the *logos.* It is, now, not a wild guess, that in the island of Tarsus, his birthplace, Paul, who must have been a bright young man, had come under the influence of the conception that a spiritual mediatorship existed between God and the world. When at an early age he left Tarsus to go to Jerusalem, before probably the end had come to Jesus—though he personally never came into concourse and contact with the prophet of Nazareth, the schools which he attended, the academy in which he was enrolled a pupil of Gamaliel, a grandson of the famous Hillel, must not have been free from this teaching, while, on the other hand, the Galilean hills must have sounded the wonder deeds of Jesus, revered as none other by a certain class of people. After the death of Jesus, it seems that Paul went a second time from Tarsus to Jerusalem, where he met with some of the disciples who had come in contact with Jesus. It is more than likely that he heard from their

lips the story of his life adorned even so early with legend grown on the rich soil of love and theological conceptions. This story could not but have made a deep impression on him; though—a phenomenon so often noticed in the history of great men—the first impression was that of resistance to what he later burned to proclaim from the very housetops.

Paul was of noble birth. Nobility in those days was not of the blood exactly; it was certainly not of wealth. Who in those days constituted the aristocracy among the Jews; those whom to meet was deemed a rare privilege? Was it the millionaire? Ah! no; the touch of his hand was not the boon coveted. Was it the high priest, in ignorance but in pomp and state performing the measured functions of his office? No; learning wove the crown of glory in those days; and Paul was descended from a family of the tribe of Benjamin, in whom learning had been an ambition transmitted from father to son. In Jerusalem he was brought into closest sympathy with the Pharisees. Gamaliel at the head of the Academy was his own personal instructor. In such surroundings he could not but become imbued with the spirit of Judaism as polarized in the Pharisaic axis. He grew up a strict observer of the law and well versed in the dialectics which anchored the legal enactments upon the rock bed of the Pentateuchal texts. The first impulse, then, when he heard from lips of Nazarenes the story of the life and the death of Jesus, their prophet and Messiah, was one of resistance and horror. We know, from the story of his life, that among the persecutors of the young, rising Christian communities, none was perhaps so zealous and displayed such bitter fanaticism as Saul of Tarsus. He assisted at the lapi-

dation of Stephen, the brother of Jesus; he was ever thereafter fired with passion to crush out the growing heresy; he even went so far, weaponed with a letter of introduction from high authorities, as to repair to Damascus in order to denounce the refugees of the Christian brotherhood, fled to that city for safety. On the way to Damascus, an event took place which turned out to be for him of sublime and supreme moment,—marking a crisis in his whole life and giving an opposite turn to his ambitious activity. It is certain that he beheld Jesus; he himself says so. He heard the master's voice; he was met by him on the road to Damascus. Glorious light seemed to flood the horizon, and in that light he read the new promise and the new revelation. Bungling rationalism, the stock in trade of men like Ingersoll and others of his ilk, legitimate one hundred years ago, but to-day entirely out of rhyme with the thought of modern science on these questions, shrugging its shoulders with affectation of superior wisdom, would claim that either St. Paul invented the story in order to shield his change of heart, or, if he saw anything, he merely was dazzled by the zigzagging of lightning from the sky above. Orthodoxy, again, has claimed and does claim, that the Apostle actually did behold in the flesh him who was crucified. How do *we* account for the phenomena? Modern psychology has cast the light of its searching torch into the darkest nooks and corners of the human soul. We have recognized to-day the possibility of autohypnotism, "self-suggestion" of certain phenomena. Rivet your attention on one subject, be bound up in it so that, as it were, in it you lose your own identity; it will haunt you in your dreams and it will

persist at your elbow in your waking hours. Have you not had similar experiences? Have you not heard voices from the land beyond; have you not occasionally in the busy streets in Chicago turned to see whether face was behind you or form had followed you? And to a greater extent than this, though in the same psychological process involved, come such phenomena to great minds stirred up to their depths. A man organized as Saul of Tarsus was, could he escape pondering upon the peculiarities presented to him by the few Christians who then had with the tendrils of a loving soul embraced the story and the life of Jesus of Nazareth as a promise of the near dawn of kingdom come?

He could not; he had heard the story; he was a Jew of the Jews, strict in the performance of his duties arising under the law. He must have—for such theological minds are not born in an hour—he must often before have asked himself the question: What is the root of this constant dissatisfaction, which is the heirloom of every thinking mind and every feeling heart? Why is it that we crave for satisfaction and it as persistently eludes us? Why is it that the law does not satisfy me; why is it that I, the strict adherent of legal Judaism, am in constant danger of violating the law? Some of you who have been brought up under Jewish orthodox influence know what is implied in being a loyal Jew of the old school: not a motion of the hand but is tied to an article of the code; not a twitching of the finger but will brush against some other paragraph of the law. The conclusion is not far off—though not altogether true—that one is not free, but bound under the law, a slave under law. That mechanical legalism cannot still the inborn yearning, is an unavoidable ex-

perience. It adds a new thorn to the flesh. This experience must have been Paul's. He must have fretted and chafed under the "Yoke of the Law," for he committed the error of overlooking the spirituality of the "Law." He confounded Thorah with *nomos* and reduced Judaism to a *mere* chain of legal enactments. And now he came in contact with a community of men, Jews, too—for the early Christians were Jews—observing the law as scrupulously as he did, but who apparently had found the peace he craved, their eyes glistened with a hope new to him; they braved death to witness to their new confidence; they expatriated themselves even and complained not. He had been a spectator at the execution of Stephen and must have been touched by his heroism. How often has death on the gallows been the portal for the propagation of an idea? For you cannot retard the march of ideas by hanging a few wretches who are its exponents. They may kill till doomsday in Paris the demented men that throw the bombs, but the idea which even through their barbarous perversion would have a hearing, will knock at the gate until it has performed its errand. The very stone cast of Jesus's brother became the corner-stone of the church, and Paul, assisting at the sacrifice, could not defend himself against the impression left by the fate of him who was executed. Plead for capital punishment, as has been done in this city of late by men even who claim to have the monopoly of all ethical ideas, if you must; capital punishment is absolutely impotent, and it is and remains a relic of barbarism. Not one that is executed but becomes in a certain sense a hero. The worst criminal "dying game" is not a deterrent but an incentive to his comrades in

crime! Not alone once, a thousand times has history verified this judgment; the death of Stephen is one of the many proofs of this historical proclamation. On the way to Damascus he must have yielded more and more at every step to his preoccupation, pondering and pondering the mystery of his own soul and the fortitude of the persecuted until his nerves were strung to their last tension. Thought and nerve are inseparable companions. Cool, calm men that cannot be disturbed, but rarely explore the depths of passionate convictions. Nervous temperaments are the prerequisites of such as would unhinge the gates, behind which are held the chariots of onward moving mankind. Creative genius cannot light its tapers in the rainbow colors of an iceberg, tipped with sun-light. Its lamp blazes forth where Vulcan heats the hearth and blows the bellows. Every prophet is of the volcanic guild. And Paul had within his bones the "consuming fire."

With his thoughts concentrated on this one ruling idea and perplexity, the crisis came to him as it did to the prophets of old. There stood before him—as though in flesh and bone—the vision. His ears tingled with voices. Did they have their cradle within him? What that to him? He saw, he heard—and he succumbed. The vexation he had puzzled over so long had at last overpowered him. And he came to Damascus a changed man; Saul the persecutor was changed into Paul the Apostle.

His further personal history does not interest us in this connection. We are in quest not so much of a detailed itinerary of his checkered life, as we are of a succinct exposition of his fundamental ideas. The Jesus

that he had seen on his way to Damascus now took in his system the place of the *"logos"* of Philo. He became the "mediator" between God and man. He was *one* with God. Paul could all the more readily so conceive of *logos*-Jesus, as in the rabbinical theology the *Thorah* was represented as pre-existent in God, God's veritable only born son; and to it was assigned, though rather poetically than dogmatically, the mediating character. But whence the need of a mediator? From the first, Paul in his epistles is busy discussing the relation of man to God. Are God and man at peace, or are they divided? Psychology seems to point to the second member of the alternative. Man is hounded by dissatisfaction, and still has the craving for perfection, though he cannot attain unto it. Led by this common experience, Paul is led into a fundamental error—upon which rests his whole system. He confounds the inward gnawing sense of dissatisfaction and imperfection with sin, and he makes of sin, not the violation of one law or another, but a state. Sin is a state! Originally perfection was man's dower. But he lost it. Sin is the curse brought upon the race by its own ancestors. It is of Adam; and through Adam has come upon all descended from Adam. Originally man was free from this dissatisfaction; originally man was made perfect; but Adam sinned, and his sin fixed its own resulting condition upon all of his children. The idea of transmissal of guilt is not Jewish. The Semite seems, however, to have inclined to the view that character depends upon ancestry. (See Wellhausen, Skizzen III. p. 194.) Jewish law recognizes to a certain extent the heredity of evil, but limits the operation to four generations. Yahweh, Yahweh, All-merciful

and gracious, preserving his love unto thousands of generations, but visiting the sins of the fathers upon the sons, the sons of the sons again to the fourth generation. Further than this, according to the Jewish notion, the baneful effect of sin does not extend. I will not attempt to prove the correctness of this limitation; perhaps natural science may take exception to this, and have cogent reasons to insist that a still more remote ancestor than the great grandfather is responsible for our shortcomings. I merely would recall the fact that Jewish thought, when emphasizing the antithesis between the everlasting blessing of good, and the limited visitation of evil, fixes the fourth generation as the self-extinction of sin. Moreover, Ezekiel announces most clearly that son shall not die for the guilt of the father. Among the Greeks this idea was greatly spread. The old Greek tragedies are written in the same fundamental keys in which Paul's proclamation runs. The Greek dramatists speculate on and operate with black *Ate,* the black fate of sin that roots in the family and is transmitted from generation to generation, until expiation or atonement is made.

In Paul the notion of transmissal of guilt, arrested merely by expiation, is Greek, not Jewish, however much he may strain in true Rabbinical fashion Bibilical texts to prove his point. That a substitute may neutralize the consequences of some other's deeds is also a thought which the Jewish mind has not evolved. It rises from the back-ground of ancient tribal organization; and the involved institution of the blood avenger. Blood for blood, in which the life of one of the clan does answer for the life of the other. The *Goel Haddam* misapplied, is root to Paul's idea of vi-

carious atonement. The Greeks, on the other hand, were not disinclined to such a view. For instance in Prometheus Bound by Aeschylus, Hermes addresses stubborn and suffering Prometheus thus: "Of such agony hope not the end, before a substitute for thy torture, a god, appears; then have thee ready for thee to descend to sunless Hades." We have some idea of a god offering himself a vicarious atonement for the sin of Prometheus; and before such expiation, he cannot be freed. Of Greek origin thus appears this element of Paul's soteriology. Sin is death. Redemption therefore includes the victory over death. He who came to save the world, rises from the dead. The notion of the resurrection was familiar to the Jews. This is not the place to discuss the mooted question when and whence this doctrine formed a foothold in Jewish thought. In the Pharisaic hope, it was a cardinal element. However, Paul gives it a new direction. In the twist which he gave the familiar notion, no Jew had entertained it. A national hope was dwarfed into a single event, in turn forced to bolster a dogmatic construction. As in this case, so in many more Paul borrows his terms and ideas even from current Jewish phraseology; but in each instance he applies his material in a way anti-Jewish. In the Jewish Haggada, *e. g.,* the indications are not few that certain conceptions had been current among the Jews. But this is the difference: In Paul's system they are crystalized into a dogma, in the Jewish Haggada they are poetic solutions.

The deterioration consequent upon the "fall" are dwelt on in the Haggada of the rabbis, but their statements are translucent legends, not opaque and obscure dogmas. Before Adam sinned he was so tall that his

of the world to the other; when he sinned, God laid his hand upon him and reduced him to the common mortal size. The Haggada operates also with the equation, sin and death and satan and serpent. But it cannot be repeated too often, these extravagances are indulged in for purposes of homiletic applications of Biblical texts. As dogmas these legends are anti-Jewish. Judaism, whatever its qualification, rejects the dogma of original sin, and the consequent need of justification by faith in the vicarious atonement of the second Adam, came to wash away with his blood the sin of the first. The distinction between the grace of God and his justice, so fundamental in Paul's dogmatic exposition, is not a free invention of his. The "mercy-seat" and the "throne of justice" of God are standing figures of speech in Rabbinical sermons. But as Judaism, whatever may be said to the contrary, did *never* teach a God of wrath, who must be propitiated by blood—*See* Micah's words in the sixth chapter of his prophecy— the whole theory of Paul is a departure from, not an exposition of Judaism. As Philo views everything in the O. T. as a symbol and allegory, so Paul regards it as a type. Adam is type. The sacrificial ritual is typical of the one final supreme sacrifice. His antithesis between *law* and *love* falls into the same category. Though the O. T. itself protests that "Love God" demands not sacrifice, Judaism is regarded as mere legalism. What is, according to Paul, the province of this old Jewish law, and why was the world left to its cruel fate so long? Why were men by God abandoned so long to go to perdition? Paul was a thinker. He felt the difficulty of the question. In the epistle to the Romans he gives the answer. God

delayed redemption so long that the world under sin might recognize that life outside of God was the high-road to perdition. Sin is the very glory of God. Sin had to run its destiny, so that in the conviction of the gentile world should come at last the day when, despair seizing them, they found their culture broken reeds on which to support themselves. The case of the Jews was somewhat different. The law, God-given would indeed make perfect were it possible for man to fulfill the law, but the law cannot be fulfilled. From his premises, Paul is right in saying that the law, instead of decreasing sin, increases it. There is none that is perfect, that is the experience of the law. The law in thus, instead of diminishing the sense of sin, enhancing it, was a pedagogue unto Christ. The Law must yield to faith. Faith in Jesus, who conquered through his resurrection death, and who was born into this world without sin, gives us back the heirloom taken from us by Adam's disobedience. Those that accept shall enter into new life; they are regenerated, born anew as it were, a new nature put into them.

The young church was soon ablaze with the controversy about the further obligatory character of the law. Was the new message for the world, or was it merely for the Jew? Paul took the bold step: he planted himself on the basis, that as the law was merely a pedagogue unto Christ, with the coming of Christ the law was for the Christian abrogated. St. Peter, the Jewish apostle, and the Jew-Christians, claimed that the law was not set aside; that in order to join the new community, circumcision was essential. Had Paul not taken the stand he did, Christianity would not have spread. Judaism before Paul's time had begun to extend its influence, but

the barriers of the law kept out a waiting world. In the days of Paul men were yearning for a new light, they were athirst and cried out, as the children of Israel in the desert cried out to Moses: Give us water, that we may drink. But Peter, as the Jews before him, insisted the barriers shall stand; none shall be admitted except he have the seal of the covenant in his flesh. Paul with one bold sweep of the pen opened the gates for the conquest and conversion of the world. Had the Jews of that time been able to read the inscription on the wall, had they looked at the hand on the dial, they might have reclaimed the world with the ethics, their own ethics, lived and taught by Jesus of Nazareth; they might have gone forth and brought to the thirsty the water, to the hungry the bread of life. But they would not, as to-day they will not. The times were ripe; Judaism neglected the opportunity. Paul embraced it. He preached in words comprehensible to the pagan world the doctrine which he had discovered in his own God-touched heart. Yea; there is much at which we take exception in his system. We do not grant that Judaism is law; the prophetic system is not law, legalism is a compromise. The Judaism of the prophets is not law. This no one has recognized so deeply as one whose whole life work was to show this error in Paul's conception of Judaism. Consult Dr. Samuel Hirsch's exposition of our religion if you would learn that, while antagonistic to Paulinian dogmatism and mysticism, it is not nomism.

Judaism itself has broken with legalism; but it does not commit with Paul the mistake to underrate ethical action. Faith, certainly men must have; without faith the world must come to an end. Ye who love your

children and work for humanity, mind, Faith is the steam that turns the wheels of humanity. But this faith is not the mystic something which, Paul holds, leads to salvation. Is character nothing? Paul's exaggeration of faith is a reaction upon the legalism of the synagogue. Why is it that so many brought up among our orthodox will have nothing of Judaism after they escape from their tutors? Why is it that ethical culture finds nowhere so eager recruits as from among the ranks of the orthodox Jews?

Mendelssohn's fate illustrates the reason. His own children went forth from Judaism and separated from it. The Mendelssohns are no longer Jews, they are officially Christians; it was the legalism of Mendelssohn that superinduced their apostasy. Paul from being a Pharisee 'Hassid had to go to the other extreme. He accentuated faith and despised work. But the world is once more coming around to the other pole. Paulinian Christianity is gradually developing into the Christianity of Jesus. Christianity of this latter order and our religion are twin brothers. Character is the sacramental word of our religion. This Paul did not understand; this Jesus understood; this we understand. Paul's great deed was to carry Jewish thought, even in his form, into the world. He left behind the narrow confines of Judaism to win the globe. His fate and the experience of his movements is full of instruction. Did the freedom which Paul craved ever come? It did not. The slavery of the law was exchanged for the shackles of creed and dogma; the free thought and the free life which he coveted did not ensue. And so it will be in these latter days. Separate from Judaism! Freedom will soon yield to a new slavery. Liberalism is safest

when protected by the historical associations with Judaism. As yet the Christian church is too potent for us to loosen what historical connection we have. It is a law that smaller bodies are attracted by the larger. Around the sun spin a thousand asteroids; they are largely of the sun; but the sun draws them back and feeds upon his own offspring. And so it is with unhistorical liberal movements; instead of leading to larger liberty, they event in greater slavery. Best protected is liberal thought, the religion of character, in its historical frame; we can work from this fulcrum to lift the world. This is our conviction. There is no necessity to leave Judaism to win the world. Open your gates, but let it be *your* gates, for the righteous to enter thereinto.

That much we may learn from the history of Paul's church. The apostle was a man of little prepossessing appearance; a man racked by disease; a man whose eyes were weak; a man who had to win his livelihood in the sweat of his brow; a man of whom no one would have dreamt that under the misshapen body burned a fire-consumed soul. In such ungainly frame God's spirit loves to dwell occasionally. This tent-maker, blear-eyed, disease-racked, lifted the Roman world out of its hinges. The world has learned to distil the waters of its faith, to filter them once more. And what is the purified stream? As the religion of the dogmatist is separated, there will be found the religion of Jesus, which is our religion: Judaism universal.

THE INALIENABLE DUTIES OF MAN.
I.

No phrase has carried during the last hundred years or more, so great an emphasis as has "The rights of man." Without fear of laying one's self open to the charge of exaggeration, one may say that the political and the social thought of this century has taken its keynote from this expression. It has been enlarged into many a document; it has formed the theme of many a stirring appeal. It has been preached from the housetops; it has been repeated in the school-rooms; it has been thundered forth from the hustings; it has served as the weapon of the demagogue and the palladium of the true patriot. In times of great popular uneasiness it has been thrown as oil on troubled waters. In days of great popular indignation it has often fanned the flame of popular fury. It has gained a hearing in counting-houses. It has echoed in the closet of the student. It floats out upon the breeze from the dome of the nation's capitol. It is the diapason of almost every state paper. It is the *Leitmotif,* so to speak, of many a decision rendered by the highest tribunals of this land. It is the convenient plea for lawyers whose clients would escape their obligations.

steep, to salvation runs along the heights of moral endeavor and moral uplook. The official church, on the other hand, is anchored to a creed; belief is essential, practice is held under contempt; and as the impulse to creed grows stronger with the circling years, conduct and character are considered to be mere dross—worthless chaff to be carried away by the wind; while faith, and faith alone is proclaimed to be the key wherewith to unlock the gateway of the hereafter, open only to those that accept, and closed to all others—be it through ignorance or be it through perversion—that do not accept the fundamental dogma.

Who is responsible for this utter change of attitude? Greek thought and Greek philosophy have dug this new channel, along which the waters welling from the Pools of Siloah ran along with ever more sluggish pace, while they might have flowed, had they been permitted to obey their own original roadbed, in limpid, crystal purity. Their enforced indolence made them an easy prey to the fickle sand sweeping down upon them from the banks of the new excavation, and threatened to throttle them in a swamp of their own making. The focus, so to speak, in which sunlight from Palestine's hills and thought waves from Athen's acropolis met, was the mind of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. No man has affected the destiny of our family so deeply and so permanently as has this tent-maker of Tarsus. Speak of the mighty heroes on battle field and in battle heat unmoved, who thundered forth, over legions too numerous to be counted, the word of advance; speak of the heroes of peace that spend their days in the search after truth, mounting the weary steps leading to the watch-tower of the night, to communicate with the

stars above, or descending into the very bowels of the earth to read the stony inscriptions treasuring the very records of our earth's creation; speak of those heroes of the mind that impatient of fragmentary knowledge, at personal sacrifice of time and treasure, sally forth into untrodden territories and brave the darts of the fever and the poisoned arrows of the hostile savages in their quest after information; speak of the giants of industry that link together distant zones by ligatures of iron and steel; or surgeons that cut the umbilical cord binding daughter island to mother continent. None of these has so materially, so deeply, so lastingly stamped his own thought upon the human race as has, and does to the present day, the poor, misshapen Jew, Roman citizen though he was, whose cradle stood at Tarsus and whose school years were spent at the feet of Jerusalem's patriarchs. Should ever, by some hap or other, the greatest lights be extinguished in the galaxy spanning the centuries, longer than any other star would scintillate above in power his name. Yea, none has so deeply, I repeat, affected the destiny of the human family as has Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles. On his account wars were waged; by his doctrine humanity was cleft into hostile camps; his words have been the burden of many a human soul and again have been the stay of as many other human hearts. He has cited the demons of terror to gather around the bed where agonized poor human mortal clay in terror and anxiety of what would come after the final struggle of life; and he has winged with confidence of peaceful hope and assurance other souls impatient to shuffle off this mortal coil and to enter the truer kingdom of light, of love and of life. Whatever our own religious opinions may be, this fact

alone should assure for his words and his doctrines a careful and a close attention.

We cannot understand Paul without first comprehending the peculiar change wrought by the contact of Jewish thought with Greek doctrines before his coming, which resulted in a certain phase of Judaism. Paul would be an impossibility, original as he is, without Philo before him, without Alexandrian Judaism as the mother well for him to drink from. Even the most original minds are linked to their antecedents; none—unless it be in modern time, where originality is as cheap as the mud in our city streets—none is self-made in the work shop where thought spins its eternal threads. What the best, what the brightest of our kind may hope to accomplish is to weave a new design into the pattern, but the threads which we employ and which we cast backward and forward with the flying shuttle are taken from the bobbin on which are wound the reflections of the men who lived before us. There is historical continuity and, therefore, historical connectedness in the evolution of thought. We stand on our past, and so did Paul rise to his giant stature on the shoulders of those that preceded him. When Jew came first in contact with Greek, a new opportunity opened for him. No greater distance can possibly be imagined between two poles of thought than is that which gapes between Greek and Jewish mind. The Greek is typically Aryan, as such it inclines to analysis, the Jewish to synthesis; the Greek scales to truth by the round of details; the Jew soars to truth by the energy of sentiment and feeling; the Jew is intensely personal, the Greek is as intensely abstract; the Jew reads world and nature in terms of an equation of personality in

which the two factors are rigidly kept apart; the original Semitic God is indeed living alone beyond the world; he governs the world, but he is not immanent in it. The original Semitic God idea has been preserved in the Koran, or perhaps I had better say carried therein to its furthest consistency. God and man are separated, and the cleavage between them is as impassable as is a gulch cut by the water courses in a rugged mountain. Even later Mohammedan theology and philosophy were unable to span that chasm with a bridge steady and secure. This Semitic God idea is modified, of course, in the theology of the prophets; but taking it as a whole it remains unshakably true, that Mohammed, and not Spinoza, is strikingly Semitic.

Universe and God are two divided poles for the Semite, while the Greek rather views them as one, differentiated under two aspects. The difficulty for Jew and Greek to understand each other was not the result of difference of language alone. The Greek could not conceive of an extra-mundane God; the gods of the Greeks lived in the world; they did not merely send forth the storms their messengers and command the lightning to run on their swift errands; they did not merely bid the waters stand still, or the sea to rise in wrath—the gods were the water, the gods were the winds. God was immanent, not transcendental.

But Jew and Greek a few centuries before Paul had come into closer communion. Alexander the Great, in his ambition to found a world empire, had mixed the ingredients of a new humanity with the pestle of war. Stamping and grinding humanity in the mortar he forced into closest contact Greek and Jew. In consequence of this, arose the necessity for the Jewish

thinkers in Alexandria to present their to the Greek utterly inconceivable system, in a form that might bring it nearer to the understanding of the Greek mind. Certain concepts found even in certain books of their old Hebrew Bible, stood them in good stead for this purpose. The so-called wisdom literature, in itself free from national bias and therefore more readily appealing to the sympathies of the Hellenized Jews of Egypt, proved the suggestive source of mediating thoughts; for in these books wisdom appears almost in the light of an independent essence under God through which the world is guided. On the other hand, as they became more familiar with Greek thought, they found something analogous to this in Plato's system. Greek philosophy had evolved the poetic notion, that God in creating the world had conceived first in his own mind the perfect universe; actual creation was merely clothing with visible reality the idea which had taken life and shape in the mind of the Creator. Platonism, or to be more accurate, Neo-Platonism reigned supreme in the academies of Alexandria. The view that God had associated with him a second energy, the ideas through which he acted upon the world, lay ready to hand. The abstract God in his sublime majesty was out of nexus with the universe; he had deputized the ideas to act in his behalf. The Jewish mind and the Greek had thus apparently come to the same conclusion. The Jewish current had reflected divine wisdom as the potency of creation; the Greek had emphasized a similar view, that God's ideas are the principles by which the world is called into being. Here was now promise of reconciliation; the two lines of thought had this point in common. Here they intersected. Idea and

"Chokhmah" are the *logos,* divine reason, the mediator which the Greek mind needed to link world to God and man to his supreme creator. It is a Jewish thinker, Philo, contemporaneous with Jesus, who systematizes this peculiar view of the universe. God creates the world through *logos;* God acts on the world through *logos.* In Philo, it is not clear whether *logos* be merely a hypostasis, projection of God himself, or it be a second personality of God himself. At all events, Philonism had thoroughly prepared the soil for the planting of the seed from which Paulinian theology could grow. From Philo it was but one step to Paul's dogma. The fourth gospel, whatever the age of its composition, before or after the epistles, is the echo of Hellenistic Alexandrian speculations. It identifies Christ with the *logos.* It is, now, not a wild guess, that in the island of Tarsus, his birthplace, Paul, who must have been a bright young man, had come under the influence of the conception that a spiritual mediatorship existed between God and the world. When at an early age he left Tarsus to go to Jerusalem, before probably the end had come to Jesus—though he personally never came into concourse and contact with the prophet of Nazareth, the schools which he attended, the academy in which he was enrolled a pupil of Gamaliel, a grandson of the famous Hillel, must not have been free from this teaching, while, on the other hand, the Galilean hills must have sounded the wonder deeds of Jesus, revered as none other by a certain class of people. After the death of Jesus, it seems that Paul went a second time from Tarsus to Jerusalem, where he met with some of the disciples who had come in contact with Jesus. It is more than likely that he heard from their

lips the story of his life adorned even so early with legend grown on the rich soil of love and theological conceptions. This story could not but have made a deep impression on him; though—a phenomenon so often noticed in the history of great men—the first impression was that of resistance to what he later burned to proclaim from the very housetops.

Paul was of noble birth. Nobility in those days was not of the blood exactly; it was certainly not of wealth. Who in those days constituted the aristocracy among the Jews; those whom to meet was deemed a rare privilege? Was it the millionaire? Ah! no; the touch of his hand was not the boon coveted. Was it the high priest, in ignorance but in pomp and state performing the measured functions of his office? No; learning wove the crown of glory in those days; and Paul was descended from a family of the tribe of Benjamin, in whom learning had been an ambition transmitted from father to son. In Jerusalem he was brought into closest sympathy with the Pharisees. Gamaliel at the head of the Academy was his own personal instructor. In such surroundings he could not but become imbued with the spirit of Judaism as polarized in the Pharisaic axis. He grew up a strict observer of the law and well versed in the dialectics which anchored the legal enactments upon the rock bed of the Pentateuchal texts. The first impulse, then, when he heard from lips of Nazarenes the story of the life and the death of Jesus, their prophet and Messiah, was one of resistance and horror. We know, from the story of his life, that among the persecutors of the young, rising Christian communities, none was perhaps so zealous and displayed such bitter fanaticism as Saul of Tarsus. He assisted at the lap-

dation of Stephen, the brother of Jesus; he was ever thereafter fired with passion to crush out the growing heresy; he even went so far, weaponed with a letter of introduction from high authorities, as to repair to Damascus in order to denounce the refugees of the Christian brotherhood, fled to that city for safety. On the way to Damascus, an event took place which turned out to be for him of sublime and supreme moment,—marking a crisis in his whole life and giving an opposite turn to his ambitious activity. It is certain that he beheld Jesus; he himself says so. He heard the master's voice; he was met by him on the road to Damascus. Glorious light seemed to flood the horizon, and in that light he read the new promise and the new revelation. Bungling rationalism, the stock in trade of men like Ingersoll and others of his ilk, legitimate one hundred years ago, but to-day entirely out of rhyme with the thought of modern science on these questions, shrugging its shoulders with affectation of superior wisdom, would claim that either St. Paul invented the story in order to shield his change of heart, or, if he saw anything, he merely was dazzled by the zigzagging of lightning from the sky above. Orthodoxy, again, has claimed and does claim, that the Apostle actually did behold in the flesh him who was crucified. How do *we* account for the phenomena? Modern psychology has cast the light of its searching torch into the darkest nooks and corners of the human soul. We have recognized to-day the possibility of autohypnotism, "self-suggestion" of certain phenomena. Rivet your attention on one subject, be bound up in it so that, as it were, in it you lose your own identity; it will haunt you in your dreams and it will

persist at your elbow in your waking hours. Have you not had similar experiences? Have you not heard voices from the land beyond; have you not occasionally in the busy streets in Chicago turned to see whether face was behind you or form had followed you? And to a greater extent than this, though in the same psychological process involved, come such phenomena to great minds stirred up to their depths. A man organized as Saul of Tarsus was, could he escape pondering upon the peculiarities presented to him by the few Christians who then had with the tendrils of a loving soul embraced the story and the life of Jesus of Nazareth as a promise of the near dawn of kingdom come?

He could not; he had heard the story; he was a Jew of the Jews, strict in the performance of his duties arising under the law. He must have—for such theological minds are not born in an hour—he must often before have asked himself the question: What is the root of this constant dissatisfaction, which is the heirloom of every thinking mind and every feeling heart? Why is it that we crave for satisfaction and it as persistently eludes us? Why is it that the law does not satisfy me; why is it that I, the strict adherent of legal Judaism, am in constant danger of violating the law? Some of you who have been brought up under Jewish orthodox influence know what is implied in being a loyal Jew of the old school: not a motion of the hand but is tied to an article of the code; not a twitching of the finger but will brush against some other paragraph of the law. The conclusion is not far off—though not altogether true—that one is not free, but bound under the law, a slave under law. That mechanical legalism cannot still the inborn yearning, is an unavoidable ex-

perience. It adds a new thorn to the flesh. This experience must have been Paul's. He must have fretted and chafed under the "Yoke of the Law," for he conmitted the error of overlooking the spirituality of the "Law." He confounded Thorah with *nomos* and reduced Judaism to a *mere* chain of legal enactments. And now he came in contact with a community of men, Jews, too—for the early Christians were Jews—observing the law as scrupulously as he did, but who apparently had found the peace he craved, their eyes glistened with a hope new to him; they braved death to witness to their new confidence; they expatriated themselves even and complained not. He had been a spectator at the execution of Stephen and must have been touched by his heroism. How often has death on the gallows been the portal for the propagation of an idea? For you cannot retard the march of ideas by hanging a few wretches who are its exponents. They may kill till doomsday in Paris the demented men that throw the bombs, but the idea which even through their barbarous perversion would have a hearing, will knock at the gate until it has performed its errand. The very stone cast of Jesus's brother became the corner-stone of the church, and Paul, assisting at the sacrifice, could not defend himself against the impression left by the fate of him who was executed. Plead for capital punishment, as has been done in this city of late by men even who claim to have the monopoly of all ethical ideas, if you must; capital punishment is absolutely impotent, and it is and remains a relic of barbarism. Not one that is executed but becomes in a certain sense a hero. The worst criminal "dying game" is not a deterrent but an incentive to his comrades in

crime! Not alone once, a thousand times has history verified this judgment; the death of Stephen is one of the many proofs of this historical proclamation. On the way to Damascus he must have yielded more and more at every step to his preoccupation, pondering and pondering the mystery of his own soul and the fortitude of the persecuted until his nerves were strung to their last tension. Thought and nerve are inseparable companions. Cool, calm men that cannot be disturbed, but rarely explore the depths of passionate convictions. Nervous temperaments are the prerequisites of such as would unhinge the gates, behind which are held the chariots of onward moving mankind. Creative genius cannot light its tapers in the rainbow colors of an iceberg, tipped with sun-light. Its lamp blazes forth where Vulcan heats the hearth and blows the bellows. Every prophet is of the volcanic guild. And Paul had within his bones the "consuming fire."

With his thoughts concentrated on this one ruling idea and perplexity, the crisis came to him as it did to the prophets of old. There stood before him—as though in flesh and bone—the vision. His ears tingled with voices. Did they have their cradle within him? What that to him? He saw, he heard—and he succumbed. The vexation he had puzzled over so long had at last overpowered him. And he came to Damascus a changed man; Saul the persecutor was changed into Paul the Apostle.

His further personal history does not interest us in this connection. We are in quest not so much of a detailed itinerary of his checkered life, as we are of a succinct exposition of his fundamental ideas. The Jesus

that he had seen on his way to Damascus now took in his system the place of the *"logos"* of Philo. He became the "mediator" between God and man. He was *one* with God. Paul could all the more readily so conceive of *logos*-Jesus, as in the rabbinical theology the *Thorah* was represented as pre-existent in God, God's veritable only born son; and to it was assigned, though rather poetically than dogmatically, the mediating character. But whence the need of a mediator? From the first, Paul in his epistles is busy discussing the relation of man to God. Are God and man at peace, or are they divided? Psychology seems to point to the second member of the alternative. Man is hounded by dissatisfaction, and still has the craving for perfection, thou he cannot attain unto it. Led by this common experience, Paul is led into a fundamental error—upon which rests his whole system. He confounds the inward gnawing sense of dissatisfaction and imperfection with sin, and he makes of sin, not the violation of one law or another, but a state. Sin is a state! Originally perfection was man's dower. But he lost it. Sin is the curse brought upon the race by its own ancestors. It is of Adam; and through Adam has come upon all descended from Adam. Originally man was free from this dissatisfaction; originally man was made perfect; but Adam sinned, and his sin fixed its own resulting condition upon all of his children. The idea of transmissal of guilt is not Jewish. The Semite seems, however, to have inclined to the view that character depends upon ancestry. (See Wellhausen, Skizzen III. p. 194.) Jewish law recognizes to a certain extent the heredity of evil, but limits the operation to four generations. Yahweh, Yahweh, All-merciful

and gracious, preserving his love unto thousands of generations, but visiting the sins of the fathers upon the sons, the sons of the sons again to the fourth generation. Further than this, according to the Jewish notion, the baneful effect of sin does not extend. I will not attempt to prove the correctness of this limitation; perhaps natural science may take exception to this, and have cogent reasons to insist that a still more remote ancestor than the great grandfather is responsible for our shortcomings. I merely would recall the fact that Jewish thought, when emphasizing the antithesis between the everlasting blessing of good, and the limited visitation of evil, fixes the fourth generation as the self-extinction of sin. Moreover, Ezekiel announces most clearly that son shall not die for the guilt of the father. Among the Greeks this idea was greatly spread. The old Greek tragedies are written in the same fundamental keys in which Paul's proclamation runs. The Greek dramatists speculate on and operate with black *Ate,* the black fate of sin that roots in the family and is transmitted from generation to generation, until expiation or atonement is made.

In Paul the notion of transmissal of guilt, arrested merely by expiation, is Greek, not Jewish, however much he may strain in true Rabbinical fashion Bibilical texts to prove his point. That a substitute may neutralize the consequences of some other's deeds is also a thought which the Jewish mind has not evolved. It rises from the back-ground of ancient tribal organization; and the involved institution of the blood avenger. Blood for blood, in which the life of one of the clan does answer for the life of the other. The *Goel Haddam* misapplied, is root to Paul's idea of vi-

carious atonement. The Greeks, on the other hand, were not disinclined to such a view. For instance in Prometheus Bound by Aeschylus, Hermes addresses stubborn and suffering Prometheus thus: "Of such agony hope not the end, before a substitute for thy torture, a god, appears; then have thee ready for thee to descend to sunless Hades." We have some idea of a god offering himself a vicarious atonement for the sin of Prometheus; and before such expiation, he cannot be freed. Of Greek origin thus appears this element of Paul's soteriology. Sin is death. Redemption therefore includes the victory over death. He who came to save the world, rises from the dead. The notion of the resurrection was familiar to the Jews. This is not the place to discuss the mooted question when and whence this doctrine formed a foothold in Jewish thought. In the Pharisaic hope, it was a cardinal element. However, Paul gives it a new direction. In the twist which he gave the familiar notion, no Jew had entertained it. A national hope was dwarfed into a single event, in turn forced to bolster a dogmatic construction. As in this case, so in many more Paul borrows his terms and ideas even from current Jewish phraseology; but in each instance he applies his material in a way anti-Jewish. In the Jewish Haggada, *e. g.*, the indications are not few that certain conceptions had been current among the Jews. But this is the difference: In Paul's system they are crystalized into a dogma, in the Jewish Haggada they are poetic solutions.

The deterioration consequent upon the "fall" are dwelt on in the Haggada of the rabbis, but their statements are translucent legends, not opaque and obscure dogmas. Before Adam sinned he was so tall that his

of the world to the other; when he sinned, God laid his hand upon him and reduced him to the common mortal size. The Haggada operates also with the equation, sin and death and satan and serpent. But it cannot be repeated too often, these extravagances are indulged in for purposes of homiletic applications of Biblical texts. As dogmas these legends are anti-Jewish. Judaism, whatever its qualification, rejects the dogma of original sin, and the consequent need of justification by faith in the vicarious atonement of the second Adam, came to wash away with his blood the sin of the first. The distinction between the grace of God and his justice, so fundamental in Paul's dogmatic exposition, is not a free invention of his. The "mercy-seat" and the "throne of justice" of God are standing figures of speech in Rabbinical sermons. But as Judaism, whatever may be said to the contrary, did *never* teach a God of wrath, who must be propitiated by blood—*See* Micah's words in the sixth chapter of his prophecy— the whole theory of Paul is a departure from, not an exposition of Judaism. As Philo views everything in the O. T. as a symbol and allegory, so Paul regards it as a type. Adam is type. The sacrificial ritual is typical of the one final supreme sacrifice. His antithesis between *law* and *love* falls into the same category. Though the O. T. itself protests that "Love God" demands not sacrifice, Judaism is regarded as mere legalism. What is, according to Paul, the province of this old Jewish law, and why was the world left to its cruel fate so long? Why were men by God abandoned so long to go to perdition? Paul was a thinker. He felt the difficulty of the question. In the epistle to the Romans he gives the answer. God

delayed redemption so long that the world under sin might recognize that life outside of God was the high-road to perdition. Sin is the very glory of God. Sin had to run its destiny, so that in the conviction of the gentile world should come at last the day when, despair seizing them, they found their culture broken reeds on which to support themselves. The case of the Jews was somewhat different. The law, God-given would indeed make perfect were it possible for man to fulfill the law, but the law cannot be fulfilled. From his premises, Paul is right in saying that the law, instead of decreasing sin, increases it. There is none that is perfect, that is the experience of the law. The law in thus, instead of diminishing the sense of sin, enhancing it, was a pedagogue unto Christ. The Law must yield to faith. Faith in Jesus, who conquered through his resurrection death, and who was born into this world without sin, gives us back the heirloom taken from us by Adam's disobedience. Those that accept shall enter into new life; they are regenerated, born anew as it were, a new nature put into them.

The young church was soon ablaze with the controversy about the further obligatory character of the law. Was the new message for the world, or was it merely for the Jew? Paul took the bold step: he planted himself on the basis, that as the law was merely a pedagogue unto Christ, with the coming of Christ the law was for the Christian abrogated. St. Peter, the Jewish apostle, and the Jew-Christians, claimed that the law was not set aside; that in order to join the new community, circumcision was essential. Had Paul not taken the stand he did, Christianity would not have spread. Judaism before Paul's time had begun to extend its influence, but

the barriers of the law kept out a waiting world. In the days of Paul men were yearning for a new light, they were athirst and cried out, as the children of Israel in the desert cried out to Moses: Give us water, that we may drink. But Peter, as the Jews before him, insisted the barriers shall stand; none shall be admitted except he have the seal of the covenant in his flesh. Paul with one bold sweep of the pen opened the gates for the conquest and conversion of the world. Had the Jews of that time been able to read the inscription on the wall, had they looked at the hand on the dial, they might have reclaimed the world with the ethics, their own ethics, lived and taught by Jesus of Nazareth; they might have gone forth and brought to the thirsty the water, to the hungry the bread of life. But they would not, as to-day they will not. The times were ripe; Judaism neglected the opportunity. Paul embraced it. He preached in words comprehensible to the pagan world the doctrine which he had discovered in his own God-touched heart. Yea; there is much at which we take exception in his system. We do not grant that Judaism is law; the prophetic system is not law, legalism is a compromise. The Judaism of the prophets is not law. This no one has recognized so deeply as one whose whole life work was to show this error in Paul's conception of Judaism. Consult Dr. Samuel Hirsch's exposition of our religion if you would learn that, while antagonistic to Paulinian dogmatism and mysticism, it is not nomism.

Judaism itself has broken with legalism; but it does not commit with Paul the mistake to underrate ethical action. Faith, certainly men must have; without faith the world must come to an end. Ye who love your

children and work for humanity, mind, Faith is the steam that turns the wheels of humanity. But this faith is not the mystic something which, Paul holds, leads to salvation. Is character nothing? Paul's exaggeration of faith is a reaction upon the legalism of the synagogue. Why is it that so many brought up among our orthodox will have nothing of Judaism after they escape from their tutors? Why is it that ethical culture finds nowhere so eager recruits as from among the ranks of the orthodox Jews?

Mendelssohn's fate illustrates the reason. His own children went forth from Judaism and separated from it. The Mendelssohns are no longer Jews, they are officially Christians; it was the legalism of Mendelssohn that superinduced their apostasy. Paul from being a Pharisee 'Hassid had to go to the other extreme. He accentuated faith and despised work. But the world is once more coming around to the other pole. Paulinian Christianity is gradually developing into the Christianity of Jesus. Christianity of this latter order and our religion are twin brothers. Character is the sacramental word of our religion. This Paul did not understand; this Jesus understood; this we understand. Paul's great deed was to carry Jewish thought, even in his form, into the world. He left behind the narrow confines of Judaism to win the globe. His fate and the experience of his movements is full of instruction. Did the freedom which Paul craved ever come? It did not. The slavery of the law was exchanged for the shackles of creed and dogma; the free thought and the free life which he coveted did not ensue. And so it will be in these latter days. Separate from Judaism! Freedom will soon yield to a new slavery. Liberalism is safest

when protected by the historical associations with Judaism. As yet the Christian church is too potent for us to loosen what historical connection we have. It is a law that smaller bodies are attracted by the larger. Around the sun spin a thousand asteroids; they are largely of the sun; but the sun draws them back and feeds upon his own offspring. And so it is with unhistorical liberal movements; instead of leading to larger liberty, they event in greater slavery. Best protected is liberal thought, the religion of character, in its historical frame; we can work from this fulcrum to lift the world. This is our conviction. There is no necessity to leave Judaism to win the world. Open your gates, but let it be *your* gates, for the righteous to enter thereinto.

That much we may learn from the history of Paul's church. The apostle was a man of little prepossessing appearance; a man racked by disease; a man whose eyes were weak; a man who had to win his livelihood in the sweat of his brow; a man of whom no one would have dreamt that under the misshapen body burned a fire-consumed soul. In such ungainly frame God's spirit loves to dwell occasionally. This tent-maker, blear-eyed, disease-racked, lifted the Roman world out of its hinges. The world has learned to distil the waters of its faith, to filter them once more. And what is the purified stream? As the religion of the dogmatist is separated, there will be found the religion of Jesus, which is our religion: Judaism universal.

THE INALIENABLE DUTIES OF MAN.

I.

No phrase has carried during the last hundred years or more, so great an emphasis as has "The rights of man." Without fear of laying one's self open to the charge of exaggeration, one may say that the political and the social thought of this century has taken its keynote from this expression. It has been enlarged into many a document; it has formed the theme of many a stirring appeal. It has been preached from the housetops; it has been repeated in the school-rooms; it has been thundered forth from the hustings; it has served as the weapon of the demagogue and the palladium of the true patriot. In times of great popular uneasiness it has been thrown as oil on troubled waters. In days of great popular indignation it has often fanned the flame of popular fury. It has gained a hearing in counting-houses. It has echoed in the closet of the student. It floats out upon the breeze from the dome of the nation's capitol. It is the diapason of almost every state paper. It is the *Leitmotif*, so to speak, of many a decision rendered by the highest tribunals of this land. It is the convenient plea for lawyers whose clients would escape their obligations.

"The rights of man"—for one hundred years humanity has feasted on this combination of high-toned words. The fruit of the creed it crystalizes is apparent in our day. The signs are multiplying that mankind is at last awakening to the suspicion that the so-phrased creed is, unless supplemented by an essential qualification, altogether insufficient to pillar a humanity true to its own genius, and held together by the more potent clasps of love, devotion and free service.

The few chosen ones before whom life has spread a rich banquet—whom the waves of fortune have always carried on their crest,—who have been fairly successful and found this world as now constituted, a most comfortable place to live in—perhaps do not understand even when they know of its existence and insistence the depth of unrest and the profundity of despair that now is upon millions of our fellow-men to whom life is largely a disappointment, and to whom society and the social order offer only chary opportunities to live worthy and noble lives. No truth is bodied forth by the comfortable and common assurance repeated in season and out of season to-day, that only those whose hearts rankle with the poison of jealousy and envy, the thriftless and the shiftless, the unworthy and the abnormal, are crying out for a re-constitution of the social order. This generalization may lull to thoughtless sleep him whom the Germans would label a Philistine, *i. e.* a man whose vision is hemmed in by the narrowest valley of self-interest; a man whose ears are dull to every sound save the clink of the ducats which he reaps, rightfully or wrongfully, in the harvest time of commercial enterprise.

The best of men, the purest of minds, the deepest of

thinkers, standing on the high watch peak of the age, have foreseen the portents of the day described by our prophet—the day of darkness, the day of distress, the day of disaster, and they would now raise the ensign on the hill and lift up their voice in a warning outcry, trumpeting forth to a generation verging on the deafness and blindness of selfishness, a solemn Beware! Nothing is more dangerous than such assurance cherished by the pets of success that the world is right, and society is righteously constituted.

Can it be denied, that the mere doctrine of the rights of man has played into the hands of the selfish? While it has been the lever to lift up a few, it has also, contrary to the hope and confidence of its first coiners, proven a weight to drag down the millions.

The bald theory of rights has prospered the capitalists and none other. It has sponsored a new kind of selfishness of which the former ages knew nothing. I am not talking at random. Those among you—I trust there are many—who have devoted time and thought to the study of the literature bearing on politico-economic and sociological problems, well know that my statement can easily be verified, and that, too, by the testimony of facts as solid as the granite pillars of Hercules which stand guard o'er the narrow passage way through which the Mediterranean runs to wed the boisterous Atlantic. Facts as sound as granite prove the contention that under the bald doctrine of the rights of man, capital has prospered, at the expense of the humanities. It was this one-sided doctrine which has produced what is called capitalism.

I should not, were this not a Jewish temple, pause to reiterate a pledge which often I have worded here and elsewhere, that I am not of the opinion that private

property is ethically and fundamentally wrong. Against the capitalist I have nothing to urge; but against capitalism, against a capitalistic order of society, my religion, the religion of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the religion of the best among all men—has everything to urge.

Upon the doctrine of the rights of man is founded that system of social organization the essential element of which is individualism. The men of the eighteenth century who gave us this doctrine had no insight into the true character of humanity. They labored under a grievous error. They raised each individual man as individual to the dignity of an exponential function of humanity, and operated with this, their pet formula, as though the thousand and one, the millions and billions of human beings tenanting simultaneously the globe, were merely held together by interest, neglecting altogether the factor of the organical union between man and man, insisting that essentially, an individual man represented the fullest contents of human growth.

Or, to state their proposition in other words, they taught that individuals make society. This is the fatal mistake of their philosophy, this the reason for the ultimate failure of their ethics. The individual, being the free architect of society, gives to or withholds from society his own creature, as much or as little as he pleases. His freedom is his own and is final. No other person may interfere with him and no consideration can influence him save self-interest. He fixes the measure of the contribution due by him, the individual, to society. In accordance with this view, Adam Smith and his followers, the English school of political economists, the English school of jurists, have always insisted that the scope of social action was limited while

the individual virtually had no barriers. Under the stipulations of a social contract, individuals have conceded certain privileges to society. These are fixed and limited. Beyond them any social action is an unjust infringement upon the rights of the individual. Our own political system is built on these foundations. The limitations are drawn by the constitution and it is practically unalterable. The adjustment of social burdens as found in the instrument must stand inflexibly.

Two cases recently decided are in point. In both this view was the leading thought of our highest courts —in this state as well as in the supreme court of our nation.

In this state, the factory inspection act, limiting the hours of work for women, was declared unconstitutional. From the very first day of the enactment of that law, the opinion prevailed that our supreme court would decide this legislative enactment, upon proper proceedings, to be in violation of the fundamental constitutional limitations as laid down in the organic law of the land and the state. Both our state and national constitution rest upon the doctrine that certain rights are inalienably "the rights of man." Freedom of contract is the fundamental pillar of humanity as understood by the individualistic philosophy which took shape in government as devised by the constitution. The factory act presumed that for higher purposes of humanity, for higher ends, society through its instrument and agent, the state, has the right to regulate and limit this very freedom of contract.

In whose interest were the proceedings to declare the act unconstitutional instituted? According to the arguments advanced in the pleadings, it would seem as though the legislature had done a grievous injustice to

these women by curtailing their right to covenant as they chose. If I had been in the case as a professional legal adviser, I suppose I should have adopted the same line of objections as was laid down by the master attorneys who managed to riddle the statute. I, too, should have asked the supreme court to consider that these women should not be held in tutelage; that they ought not to be deprived of their privilege to order their life as they might elect. I should have sung the good old song about the evils of parentalism and the rights of man. I should have asked the court to remember that the women who were to be interfered with were of age. They certainly ought not to be treated like children who need a guardian. If they wish to work ten hours, whose concern is it but theirs? But let us be honest. Was this suit brought for the purpose of protecting the women in the enjoyment of an inalienable right? I know not who had charge of the case. I know not who was in the manufacturers' society that brought the suit. But it was certainly not instituted to safeguard the independence of the women. This was the pretense and the pretext. It was induced by the necessities of business. We could not, if the law was allowed to stand, compete with the New York manufacturers. We were at a great disadvantage in competition. The plea for freedom played, in this case, into the hands of what I call capitalism.

As in this, so in a thousand similar cases throughout the century elapsed, the doctrine of the rights of man has generally been the helper, not of the masses, but of the classes; not of the people, but of the plutocrats, or rather the plutocratic order of society.

The other case is still more recent. The constitution

has limited the taxing powers of congress. It stipulates certain exemptions. Those exemptions must stand, for the constitution is an instrument specifying, not the duties but the formal reservations of rights that the individuals while conceding certain functions to society and its agents, government, have excepted from the effect of this concession.

Congress placed a tax upon incomes. This tax, especially if it be graded and progressive—and this, by the way, our constitution again prohibits, for taxation must be equal, not proportional,—is theoretically the most equitable of any. In America, alas, theory and practice stand at opposite poles; but in Germany the income tax is not a dead letter, nor does it trap the nation into perjury. Under the German system of self-assessments, not under oath, but upon honor—there is scarce one single default during the year—millionaire and pauper both inform the government of their own free will, of the amount of their earnings, and assume the burdens of the social obligation in due and progressive proportion. This country offers premiums to perjurers, for whoever among us is shrewd enough to cover wrong under the semblance of right, who understands where and how to "see" the assessor, finds a community ready to worship him for his sagacity; in Germany, public opinion would point the finger of contempt at the man who would under one pretext or another shirk his duty to the state.

This income tax was proposed by congress, acting under the theory of specified rights and limited functions of government. Suit is brought and our highest court decides in favor of whom? In favor of the richest men that we have in America—in favor of the owners of real estate and its proceeds, and the tax as it was left by

the first decision of the court, since revoked, was mutilated into a tax, not on capital, but on industry—on intelligence.

But, friends, do not misunderstand me. I do not wish to create the impression that I undervalue the great revolution wrought under the magic of this phrase "the inalienable rights of man." No student of history but will agree that few are the days so golden in their radiant light for humanity as are the hours when from inspired lips dropped the words "Equal and inalienable rights of man." For what would be man if he had no rights? A slave he might be. What boot would there be to own the torch of intelligence, yet not to have the right to allow its light to illumine a path self-chosen? A slave is not a man, even if he have, like Epictetus of old, a mind as keen as that which comes to genius alone, even if there be within him, like that of the misshapen Roman slave, a soul answering whatever music of the heavens fills the earth, even if his be a purpose as strong as that of him who struck the rock and forced it to give water, or stamped the desert and compelled it to become a paradise. What boot to him intelligence or love if another man's will decides what he shall do, if another man's word commands whether he shall sing or sigh, shout or shriek, shrink or shunt—what to him is freedom of mind, is intimacy with stars and sun, with flowers and ferns, with rocks and rivers, with blades and blossoms if another man can order him about now to this, anon to another task, now to the book opened, now to the scroll clasped? What boot it to him if in his soul there tingle and ring the call "Thou shalt, thou oughtst"—if another man bids him do or not do. Without rights, and rights to your own life, rights to your own property, rights to your own name, rights to

your own reputation, rights to your own self-decision how to shape life and what career to follow, human life would be not little less than God's, but much less than the beast's.

This cannot be denied, and I can well understand, as everyone of us must, that the formula "the rights of man" was a very magic to hypnotize the age of its birth. By its wine human society, during the last hundred years, has been heated to intoxication. Yet the fumes of this inebriation are about passing away; to-day the best men understand, the deepest minds comprehend, the tenderest hearts feel it, that something more is needed than the doctrine so bewitching, which carried the fathers to advance along the rugged path of progress—something still stronger than the, by our predecessors deemed final, doctrine of the rights of man.

Progress is always composed of three movements. In Hegelian jargon, thesis, antithesis and synthesis mask the successive phases. We hold by virtue of our successorship to others certain things to be true. By virtue of our own doubt, however, we are impelled to advance beyond the line marked by inherited and transmitted truth. To accomplish this, we are led to deny the propositions of the fathers. The proofs suggest themselves readily, that this is the method employed by the evolving mind of humanity. To dwell on one example for all, let us watch the course of religious progress. Belief breeds denial. When the new religion is ripening to the new harvest, from rostrum, if not from pulpit is proclaimed the new knowledge that the old gods are not. Atheism, rank denial of the old tenets, is the first movement in the progressive unfolding of religious thought.

In politics, the pendulum swings from despotism and absolute monarchy to mob-rule and the terror. The French revolution is the denial of the political dogma of the Bourbons; Rousseau and the French encyclopedists had theoretically spelled their great "No" in answer to the French king's positive declaration *"L'etat c'est moi!"* It was absolutely necessary in order that humanity might progress, that as emphatically should be spoken the protest, even by the mouth of the guillotine, " The state is not thou, but we, the people, are the state; each one is an 'I,' and as an *ego,* each one has the right to utter his pronunciamento, 'the world is I.' "

This is political atheism, so to speak, certainly political atomism, as the insistence that God is not, is religious atheism.

But, if humanity abides by this negative, the electric circuit producing the healthful current can never be closed. Every electric circuit has a negative and a positive pole. In the grander electricity of evolving life, negation is one pole, but it alone cannot engender the polar force of circling eternity, and transmit it to evolving humanity through progressive time.

Naturally humanity requires hundreds of years where the individual is chained to one solar revolution. "A thousand years," says the psalmist, "are in thy sight as yesterday when it is passed." Thousand years—mere breadth in the time movement of eternity. One sweep of the pendulum in the great chronometer of divinity. Remember, incomprehensibly long are the spans of time elapsed since the sun has flamed forth yon beacon light above, weaving life and love into our very earth. Its fire was kindled millions and millions of years ago; and even this lamp is a novelty among the torches burn-

ing in yon heavenly regions unfathomable and unsearchable above, around, beneath us. Our sun is a mere babe compared to the other suns which hold by the magnet of attraction and the hatred of repulsion, larger, grander, older, sidereal families studding with their diamond isles the bottomless ocean of firmamental life in its movements heaving and falling, keeping time to cosmic creations' cradle songs.

Now, this being the case, how laughable is the arrogance to presume that we, whose years are three score and ten, whose thoughtful life is perhaps but two score years—should understand the universe's plan and method, and distinguish between the real and the seeming!

Atheism, the first intoxication of impulse toward progress, the biting pinch of hunger for broader life, the outburst of passion for greater liberty, today has learned to exchange its arrogance for humbler garments. No one who thinks may be an atheist. Agnosticism is the virtual acknowledgment that atheism is dogmatic. This successor to atheism leaves the question open—perhaps there is—perhaps there is not that which we may call God and divine. And even agnosticism is not the creed of the age. Thousand voices, and not from the swamps of thought, but from the Alps of reflection—thousand tongues, not from the ignorant, but from the wise—not from the blind, but from the seers, have intoned again the jubilant affirmation: "God is." But this God is not the God that was before atheism protested, before agnosticism expected and waited—a God more sublime than he to whom altars were built and sacrifices were brought and prayers were sung, hymns were chanted—a God for whom though the uni-

verse is too small to contain him, the human heart is a sanctuary, encompassing and all-inclusive.

This development of religious thought may be studied in striking outlines in the history of man's attitude toward religion during this very century. The rights of man were first held to be incompatible with the claims of the church. Priest and altar were suspected of a picked intrigue to forge chains wherewith to fasten man and mind to the block. The God preached by the church was, therefore, vociferously denied by the prophets of the rights of man. The second sober thought, however, brought about a modification of the positions maintained by either party to the contest. If the church may be said to represent—to employ Hegel's phraseology—the thesis and the professional free-thinkers, the antithesis, the better view influencing both the church and its old-time antagonist has culminated in a new synthesis.

The same process is at work in the domain of political and sociological matters. The rights of man were first urged as protests against the rights of kings and rulers. Their emphasis marked the appeal for liberty of the masses over against the privileges of chosen classes. Through this formula ran and rang the outcry of humanity for a larger life. But it alone is mere atheism in the field of politics. It undermines the essential life of society by putting the individual first and society last, reducing the latter to a sum in arithmetic, an equation in statics, in stead of regarding and treating it as a theorem and function in dynamics.

Society is more than you and I, and a third one added together. It is more than the millions and millions that live simultaneously in geographical juxtaposition on this globe. A nation is more than the sum

of the individuals that compose it. Humanity is more than so many milliards of individuals and detached souls. The individual is by society—society is not by the individual. Society is the mother—the individual is the child; the reverse proposition is untrue. This positive conviction of the dynamic constitution of society and the consequent new appreciation of the scope of individual action in and under it had to be acquired. The world is learning it now. One hundred years have gone by since the emphasis was laid on the individual, and we are again in the schoolroom spelling out a new primary lesson, this new synthesis; the fruitage, the complement of the antithesis of the inalienable rights of man which in its day was the protest, the atheism, in reaction and revolt against the dogmatism and despotism of the church and state.

What is inalienable? It is that without which we cannot think that man can continue to be man. It is that which, if denied, robs humanity of its vitality. What makes us men? Is it the body which we have? Scarcely. Body like our has also the animal. It may be different in shape from ours. Our nearest of kin in the family of brutal life has four hands. He may only for a minute walk erect. He can climb; but even he foreshadowing the more perfect animal life as incorporate in us, is certainly not man, and we are not he. Physiologically considered, indeed, we are but animals. Our gastric system is a repetition of what we find even in the lowest kind of mammals. Our respiratory organs are under the same law as regulates the breathing apparatus of lion or tiger, of dog or of cat. Our optic nerves, auditory nerves—the nerves that transmit the sensation of touch, smell, all these gateways to knowledge are physiologically operating in our bodily

laboratory as they do in that of fox or wolf, or elephant or what not.

Physiologically we are animals. Is this all we are? With a mere body, we are not men. The animal dies—we die. Our dust is like that of animal. Is this all there is of man? No, man stands for more and requires more. What is that something which is inalienable to man—involved in the notion of man, without which man would not be?

First, man to be man must enjoy freedom. He must be his own master. No one else must lord it over him. Freedom to be or not to be, seemingly, even must be his; freedom to determine his own career—the means he would employ to attain the goal. No one may say to him "Thou shalt be a shoemaker; thou shalt be a physician." Happily for most of men, none may even say, "Thou shalt be a rabbi." Man must and may decide what he will be, and how he will proceed to satisfy his ambition. Without this freedom of self-determination man would not be man.

The ancient form of social organization denied him this freedom altogether. In Egypt, birth decided one's career, as in the animal kingdom birth fixes the status and station. Kitten will be cat. Cub of lion will be lion. Elephant will be elephant. Acorn will be oak. Seed will be plant. Upon this animal plan were organized India, Egypt, and a remnant of this animal compulsion, a survival of this order of instinctive organization, is absolute monarchy. This emphasis of Egypt recurs a broken echo in the philosophy of the monarchical principle.

This freedom, without which man would cease to be man, establishes the inalienable right to our life, to our liberty, to the pursuit of our happiness. We cannot be

man if we be denied the control over the product of our labor. The fruitage of our exertions must be ours, or else our freedom is a shadow, an illusion.

The convict labors. He is not master over what he produces. This absence of self-determination and control is the characteristic element in penal hard labor. This constitutes the degradation of penitentiary productivity. They are not well up in the science of penology and in the psychology of labor, who insist that labor as such is punishment. Labor as such is never degrading. On the contrary, it is the exponent of our humanity. "Thou shalt till the earth" spells not a curse; it words a blessing. Adam even before the fall worked. In the fall the law of work changed into a curse because his very conduct betrayed his desire to eat without working. That the convicts are sentenced to work is not essential to their punishment, but the degrading part of their treatment arises from the fact that their work is under compulsion, the choice of the kind of work is denied them and the proceeds of their efforts withheld from them. Not that the slave had to work made his lot so depraved, but that his was neither the choice nor the fruit of his labor. This was the demoralizing influence of the institution of southern slavery. What we produce as free men shall be ours. As we are its creators, so must we be its owners. Inalienable, therefore, is the right to our property. But —and this is the new aspect of the matter, till recent days too readily overlooked—as these rights make, and as their absence unmakes humanity, so there are duties that make and unmake humanity—duties without which man is not a man.

What those duties be that are inalienable, we shall, if you so will, study together a week from today. Let

me dismiss you today with another preliminary thought. Our age is sick unto death. Possibilities weighty and most stupendous will arise in the very next years to come. Nothing is so fatal as the sense which is very prevalent among those who have been favored—and that rightly perhaps—that things as they are, are right; that only a few malcontents are at work undermining the foundations of society. Were these foundations of the granite of justice, the few malcontents could not make an impression. Set rats to work to undermine one of the everlasting hills—we may in patience afford to laugh at the impotent attack of the insolent rodents. If these malcontents, granted they be malcontents, succeed, it must be because, where the rock of justice should pillar society, they meet only the quicksand of selfishness and self-interest.

This confidence is not shared by the best of men. Books indicate the thought of an age. There is not a work on ethics, there is not a work on social economics that today leaves the press but speaks of this problem as the pivotal question of the age. Whether the modern author believes that things must change or that things might perhaps be continued as they are—whether he be capitalistic or socialistic, anarchistic or collectivistic in his sympathies or opinions, matters not; he, the thinker, knows that this is the crucial question of the age—grave in more than one sense of the word: grave for civilization, for it might become its doom; grave on account of the possibilities of a nobler life which it holds in its womb. Yea, this deluding confidence in the justice of the established order must above all else be laid aside. The modern pulpit is charged with an anti-capitalistic leaning,—at least, the independent pulpit is under this suspicion. There be pul-

pits that are not independent. They are denied their inalienable rights. They are the little pieces of paper that are put to the tail of the congregational autocrat's kite. These dependent pulpits who do not own their souls are, indeed, not those that sound the message of the day, but where independence is vouchsafed the pulpit, or the platform, ethical culture or theistic, Christian or Jew, Unitarian or Mohammedan, all men of thought have recognized this as the main problem of modern religious study and solicitude. Why? Because the seers today understand that on the philosophy of rights, inalienable rights alone, humanity cannot work out its divine destiny.

Poets even speak of this one question. Poetry, dowered to soothe and gifted to dispel doubt and trouble, to dry tears and to charm forth smiles—even it evokes from her lyre the stress of ominous warning. Sociology has become poetic. It has consecrated its poets today. As philosophy formerly was wedded to the lighter muse, so today sociology is bound in conjugal union unto the genius of song, the messenger of bounding thought, catching the echo of the ages and translating it into the speech of the heart.

In a few years more, art will be busy with nothing but this one question. Yea, it is so now. Remember you from your visits to the World's Fair those lurid gloomy pictures—workmen by the smithy's fire, wielding the hammers? Even strikes, with their misery, their passion, their distress, and their despair have inspired the painter's pencil. As slavery put the sharpened chisel and protesting marble into the hand of sculptor, so industrial contention will soon bend to its thought and its despair, its doubts and its hopes, bronze and iron. Tomorrow in our museums will greet us—I

see her even now—woman's figure representing humanity, lifting up her hands in prayer for light, impelled by a lasting love for all her children. The masses have heard the call. As they listen it is for them burdened with the rancor of seeming injustice of which they are the victims. One king they say we dethroned when we stormed the Bastille, one king reft of his scepter when we thundered forth to England across the Atlantic: "Thou shalt not rule over us; the colonies shall be independent. They shall be for themselves, not means for thee to swell thy coffers." And yet this monarch had his ideal thought-associations. King had the glory of history woven in haloed light around his crown; king stood for the nation, incarnate and personified in his very being. To-day gold is king. The scepter it wields has neither heart nor love, has neither patriotism nor honor. Gold! To that king we must slave, say they. "Is it just?" ask they. "It cannot be changed," they are told. "If it cannot be changed, then life is of all delusions and deceptions the rankest and the bitterest. Then let us die now, and as in the Gotterdæmmerung, in the last light of the dying dusk, the despairing daughter of the gods immolates herself in the ectasy of the sacrifice, let us immolate ourselves in the fire of battle rather than starve in the slums and sink in the slime of our boasted order. The burning palaces will at least give us warmth for a few hours, and the stored up provisions divided will at least for one day still the hunger; humanity is a mere sham, let us, blind Samsons, snap the pillars of its temple. What are we more than Samsons blinded, let out to give sport to the thousands gathered in Dagon's honor. Bend the pillars. Fall, thou roof! Ruin everywhere—death at last!"

Is there no hope? Is there no other answer? Is there no sacramental word? I have no doubt there is. It comes in the old word of religion. It appears as the eternal work of "G-O-D," as the theologians spell it. The moral teacher spells it "D-U-T-Y." He who loves his humanity will have God and duty supplement our beloved catch-word "inalienable rights." God and duty, God and obligation, God and responsibility—compose the grander phrase and appeal. Inalienable rights? No, not alone are rights inalienable—inalienable are also duties. What these duties are, friends, let us study when next we meet.

No. 19

The Responsibility for the Russian Massacre

A DISCOURSE

By

EMIL G. HIRSCH

THE REFORM ADVOCATE

BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS

204 DEARBORN STREET, - - - - CHICAGO, ILL

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE RUSSIAN MASSACRE.

A DISCOURSE PREACHED BEFORE SINAI CONGREGATION SUNDAY, DEC. 3, 1905.

BY EMIL G. HIRSCH.

Text: Isaiah, xiv.

The analogy of the body politic and social to the physical frame of man is a familiar illustration of frequent and favorite recurrence in the literature of economics. That social discomfort and unrest and political disturbances and ferment should be likened to the pathological processes in the individual human organism known and dreaded as disease, will surprise no one. While the untutored mind will regard the outbreak of fever, though itself is merely an attendant indicator, in the light of a sudden catastrophe bursting upon the patient without preceding warning and connection with antecedent conditions, the experienced physician recognizes even in acute attacks the effect of toxical impregnation, the culmination of functional imperfections and sometimes organic defects of steady anterior development. Even the zymotic diseases have their period of preceding incubation. Though the producing agent is a virus or germ, it could not have affected the organ in which it found lodgment had relaxation of vigilant

and intolerant resistance not aided the hostile intruder's purpose. Symptomic therapeutics are therefore resorted to as local and immediate palliatives. The scientific diagnostician always aims at the discovery of the deeper disturbance. Prevention and elimination of conditions favoring the disintegrating and corrupting action of invading bacteria is the consecration of modern hygiene.

In the study of social crises, the distinction between the superficial symptoms and the fundamental provocation must not be neglected. Even when upheavals remind the awe-struck observer of what geologists call cataclysms, that is, sudden rushes of water sweeping aside "the monstrous births of primeval nature," different from the slow eroding perseverance of the glaciers pulverizing the impending rocks and drilling out beds for placid mountain lakes, he must not forget that the furious onslaught of irresistible inundation is the climax of cumulating causes. Nations, as well as individuals, commit follies that bring on affections of the vaso-motor nerves. They exhibit diatheses predisposing them to certain disorders. In infancy they are exposed to easy contagions betrayed by cutaneous eruptions. In old age, they incline to paralysis for atheromatous patches, as it were, form on the inner coating of the arteries, rendering these liable to rupture under pressure and superinducing cerebral hemorrhages. The distempers of a people's mind are as perplexing as are the mental maladies that eclipse or destroy the reason of individuals. The parent causes are in the greater number of cases very complex. Certainly it is possible to attribute to local congestion such outbreaks of elemental brutality as have been brought to our painful notice during the past weeks saddening us with the hor-

rible story of the martyr lot of hundreds of thousands of our brothers in Russia. But while the presence of local inflammations shall not be disputed, warned by the voice of wider experience we cannot help suspecting that these frightful local eruptions are linked to organic lesions. These remote, possibly occult irritations require attention much more studiously than do the apparent disturbances. Let us then be guided by the methods and inspired by the motives of the new science of medicine in our endeavor to locate the responsibility for these disheartening recrudescences of barbarism which we had hoped could not occur with the sun of modern civilization high in the sky.

Perhaps you will say, the sun of modern civilization has not risen above Russia's horizon and this deplorable circumstance explains the tragedy. The rulers the classes and cliques that have been the arbiters of the empire's fate for the last thirty, forty or fifty years, are primarily accountable for these outrages. They have kept the people in utter darkness and unspeakable ignorance. Where ignorance prevails prejudice and passion naturally find easy fuel. The unenlightened brain will believe slander and credit accusation while the mind trained to discriminate and reason and stored with facts is armored against the insidious suggestions of hatred and will not host the whispered insinuations of malice. Ignorance then, fostered by the ruler and his ministers, might be said to be the mother of this people's fury, the willing nurse of this demented mob's madness.

At first emunication this diagnosis might be accepted as correct. But further examination will cast doubt on it. Why was ignorance systematically organized and

furthermore where is the indigenous focus of the thousand and one misconceptions that, veritable bacteria of hellish hatred, found a prepared and prolific culture soil in the masses and mobs of the Russian Empire? Admitted that education might have checked to a certain extent the propagation of these microbes, none will maintain that they are absent where schools are numerous. The Russian Mujik cannot read or write. He believes what he is told anent the Jews. But we know that slander has been arrowed against us and has been given currency as widely and credence as wildly in learned Germany, in polite France. Even in our own America whenever the Jew is under discussion, old bitter suspicions reappear with wearying regularity, and at that on social elevations that would be looked up to as exclusive home regions of refinement and culture. It is true that ignorance mothers intolerance. But the reverse is not always established that knowledge spontaneously will evict prejudice from its domestic haunts or even disdain to fellowship with it.

Equally seductive is at first audience the statement that the real culprit is none other than the Russian system of government whose one focal conviction and supreme practice has been oppression. Repression naturally and necessarily breeds revolution. Clog the safety valve, the boiler will explode. You say, outbreaks of the magnitude, and atrocities of the kind and degree witnessed in Russia are volcanic in their nature. Leaping flames, sheaves of fire, singeing, sizzling, seething lava, devouring whirlwind of scorching ashes, withered, warped fields, blackened, fissured vineyards, buried cities, torrid tidal waves hurled by writhing, wrathful bays upon shuddering, shrinking shores,

paroxysms of shivering fear shaking wide areas, hurricanes lashing far off seas besoming the waters roaring to the rhythm of the dry land's seismic convulsions, accent the depths' impatience at repression. And of similar passion was the mood of the slaves that rose up under Eunus in Sicily and under Spartacus in Italy proper during the declining centuries of the Roman Republic. Had Rome not devised the mock Saturnalia that slaves might parade as free men, flagellate even their masters in the person of a masquerade monarch and thus perhaps through these licensed orgies of numbered duration forget their law-enacted misery and forego the appetite for Bacchanalia of murder in the precarious satisfaction of countenanced brief but wild revels? Did not the peasants that rose against their oppressors in feudal Germany rave as violently and as blindly? Does not Paris during the revolution, the terror, the Commune synonym similar thirst for guiltless blood and hunger for innocent prey? Let the simile stand in its awful impressiveness. Does it explain what we would have made clear? Vulcan's fury at constraint is indeed terrible. When in madness he wields his hammer raining terrific blows upon the anvils in his cavernous smithy, the very roof of his workshop cracks and through the rents rush forth flame and fire leaping to devour coveted food denied them in their confined hearth underneath. And the earth mightily troubled answers their roar with gasps of suffocating agony. But is this illustration altogether applicable to the carnival of carnage in recent Russia? It is plain the fury of the mob visited not the homes of them that had oppressed them but the hovels of those that had been held in bondage worse than their own. Nay, the frenzied

wreakers of ineffable ruin walked in the bloodstained footsteps of the very fiends and despoilers whose clutches had been on their throat. Of Sulla, the Roman bloodhound,—if I mistake not—one of his cotemporaries has left this characterization: "In him were combined the cruelty of the wolf, the shrewdness of the fox and the treachery of the snake." One is tempted to believe that the Ignatieffs and Plehves of Russia had sat for this portrait. Like the Roman dictator these leading spirits of Moscovite statesmanship contrived to hold their slaves in submissive loyalty by instigating them to pillage, rape, arson and assassination. Like those of their classic forerunner, their personal morals were not above scandal, their ostentatious religiosity was a cloak for the utter nudity of their soul cankered by cynic contempt for the genuine sanctities of the faith. Not far from the sober truth is he who contends that Russia's monstrous restrictive legislation against the Jews is the diabolic devise of brains fired not so much by zeal for Christianity as by greed for pelf. It had the effect of organizing "graft" into a system by which the police and the bureaucracy were supplied with a perennially flowing source at which they could enrich themselves. Somebody has described Russia as an absolute autocracy modified by periodical assassination. The records of the Romanoff dynasty bear out the epigram. An Irishman might say that many a Tzar went to bed alive in the evening to awaken dead in the morning smothered under a convenient pillow held over his face by aristocrat and royal revolutionists. But with equal accuracy, the Russian administrative system may be said to have been organized arbitrariness and injustice tempered by universal bribery. Most of the laws against

the Jews antedate the elevation to the throne of Alexander III. But no intense physical suffering resulted therefrom because under the purchaseable connivance of the highest dignitaries governors and policemen of whatever rank and range of authority were amenable to reason and humanity when the proper plea was presented that had the ring of gold.

Alexander III.'s accession marked a new departure in so far as quiet extortion with resulting proportionate increase of laxity on the part of the executive officer and a modicum of latitude for the blackmailed Jew, was now replaced by open pillage encouraged and organized by the Tzar's chief advisers without corresponding suspension, to the contrary with augmented severity of the restrictive enactments. This new era schemed thereby to satisfy two ambitions. First, it hoped these "Progroms" would like the Saturnalia at Rome, like Sulla's proscriptions for the advantage of his slaves, act like a counter-irritant and keeping the mob busy plundering and killing Jews would forestall and neutralize bitter reflections on their own wretchedness. But behind this policy of tricking the Russian people, was another Satanic purpose. Russia was to be unified into one nation wearing the livery of the penitentiary. Unity under diversity was to come to an end. All the various races, languages and religions that would prove refractory, were to be pulverized first so as to facilitate the process of moulding them into a soulless Frankenstein, dependent for life, thought, speech, sentiment upon the whim of the Tzar and the Chiefs of the Synod. The Jews, known to be certain to resist to the last this policy, were pounced upon as the one deterrent example to Poles, Finlanders, Tcherkessians

and all other factors and fractions of the hundred million population, illustrating what would be in store for them, did they dare cross the Bureaucracy's plans. As in the way of the new program, the Jews were disciplined by renewed Progroms.

The Russian police despairing that in the new Russia about to come into its own, blackmailing Jews would become one of the lost arts, may have welcomed the recent massacres as a windfall to reimburse them in advance for the prospective diminuation of their revenue. That they helped robbing and raping admits of no denial. But some high disciple of Plehve had a hand in organizing these outrages. For organized they were, and directed from one center. That the "people" did not approve of the new order of things, this to demonstrate was the motive of this hellish plot, and perhaps incidentally, to create a situation so appalling as to render imperative interference by the man on horseback or to crown the statesman able to weather the storm with the glory of being the Savious of society, the one man of the hour.

Far as the foregoing considerations go to account for the local symptoms, to my mind they leave us in the lurch at the crucial point of the problem. What suggested to Alexander III. the ruling ideas of his plan, clearly devised and cruelly executed with a view to the total extermination of the Jews that would not be converted or their expulsion from the country?

One who has kept in touch with the dominant tendencies of modern political anthropology and the practical philosophy grounded thereon, is not left without light on this query. The creed on which the civilization of this age of iron is trussed, is the hearth of the in-

fection. There is the breeding mire of the microbes that found in the experiments of autocracy a most favorable culturegrounds. Russia translated into practice what elsewhere was preached as the last and truest word of science. The Russian Mujik is the ignorant but effective worshiper at the shrine of modern economic materialism. His conduct exposes and applies the logical conclusions of the racialism and nationalism which have been haloed and hailed in many an academic publication of our day as the ultimate evangel of wisdom. This economic materialism, this arrant racialism, this myopic nationalism, the besetting follies of the age, are not parallels. They meet and intersect. And at the point where the lines converge is located the birthplace of the "shame of the century," that dementia whose barren vaporings are tricked out in the vestments of penetrating vision by the cunning of its sponsors. They knew that if they gave this bastard a pollysyllabled technical designation, it would be admitted to dignity in the society of the elect. Hence they baptized it anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism's specious pseudo-science, its falsified proclamation of anthropology's insistences, its hypocritical patriotism under the sacramental obsession of an erroneous nationalism, its artfully urged concordance with orthodox political economy and its professed solicitude for the purity of the Church's orthodox faith furnish the background and provide the justification of the Russian plan to pulverize the Jew or to exterminate him. The godless apostles of anti-Semitism of whatever plea or shade in non-Russian Europe are accessories before the fact to the murders committed in Kishineff and Odessa. The Tzar would never have dreamt of nationalizing Russia

in the manner and by the method devised by Ignatieff and Plehve, had not in the seats of learning, in the councils of nations, in the parliaments of freer peoples, in the press and on the platforms of Western Europe the accursed teaching been vocalized that certain human beings are of less fine spun clay than others, that certain groups of men are dowered by nature with pernicious instincts which they cannot help, but which as woof and web of their very texture, make them dangerous to their neighbors. The government of Russia —even the government of Russia— would have dreaded lest it be branded as unworthy of recognition in the areopagus of the nations if it connived at such fearful brutalities. But the philosophy of the day, for decades had expounded the gospel of the new naturalism; for thirty years and longer, in the books pretending to unfold the mysteries of life and of being, in phraseology seemingly dispassionately scientific, the theory has been advanced that one race of men is pre-destined to the rulership, and all other races are fore-ordained to the slave's obedience and exploitation; that the "Hebrew" race especially mixed in its composition elements unsufferable to all others, because antagonistic and antipathetic to the mother motives of Aryan civilization. Small wonder that the Russian authorities deemed their conduct justified by what they were led to think were the conclusions of science, and that the people at large were encouraged to absorb of this pseudo-scientific reasoning and translate it into action, whatever percolated downwards from the heights to the very depths; small wonder that this spurious explanation of the differences willed and made permanent by nature in the general household of the human family was welcomed as

of justification of the repressive measures concocted to accomplish the extirpation of the "worthless, offensive, dangerous brood."

The accursed doctrine of the unequal value of the races is the parent of the crimes of Russia. This pseudo-science should be cited to the bar of judgment; its mask must be torn from off its brazen face, and its immorality be exposed. Ah, there be such among us as will in time and out of rhyme, in season and out of reason, acclaim and proclaim modern naturalism and materialism as the key opening the portals to the Temple of true life as the Ariadne thread guiding safely the searcher's ventures through the labyrinth of life's secrets. Among these loudest are young people fresh from high school and even college who having picked up a few crumbs fallen from the banquet table of knowledge, tell us earnestly and learnedly that the motive and method regnant in and regulating the universe is the struggle for existence resulting in the survival of the fittest, decreeing that to the strong belongs the spoil, to the swift goes the race; that in this struggle for survival races are tested. When found to be weaker than others they must submit to their stronger competitors, or forfeit what little comfort the inferior rank may promise. The more competent nations are entitled to the supremacy while those less vigorous or less thoroughly equipped must fall back to the rear, content to wear the chains fastened upon them by their superior taskmasters.

Though misapplying the formula of natural selection to the domain of the human, this arrogant school of political and economic anthropology forgets the first principles of scientific research. Its terminology is

of the most flexible. Race is used in every conceivable manner and meaning. In one and the same breath the bewildered auditor is informed that purity of race is the one prerequisite of vanquishing strength and that the mixed races are of greater fecundity if not physically, certainly in those factors that make for superior culture. Now the Hebrew is exposed as stubbornly refusing to fertilize his blood and therefore also his mind through intermarriage; anon he is pilloried as of the basest clay, admixture with which will unavoidably and fatally visit dire deterioration upon the better races that would risk the experiment. Logic we see is not the "long suit" of these philosophers. Taking them at their word, one would expect the "Hebrews" to be lauded for their disinclination to intermarry as otherwise the fine qualities of the Teutonic-Celtic tribes might suffer incalculable and irreparable damage. They ought to be thanked for their self-denial.

Again, according to these naturalists, thought is a chemical, physical process, an exudation and distillation from brain substance. The quality of the race elements decides therefore also that of the racial mind. If Hebrews are of inferior stock, their mentality naturally must also be inferior. Nevertheless we are assured that the Hebrew's mentality is such as to render its unhampered activity a constant peril to the other tenants of earth who, though of superior physical breed, are of duller mind. Cross fertilization is invoked by the apostles of the creed as the method producing best results also in the sphere of thought. Apparently they have forgotten what they so insistently advanced the previous moment. Then the richest thought lept from the brain that was racially the purest. Now all of a

sudden the quantity and extent of absorption and assimilation of other races' thinkings determine the value of the resultant ideas. Yet for all this new declaration, the Jew is held up to scorn as the *one* family that while unproductive appropriated to itself all the culture treasures of all other clans and understood to give them the appearance of newly discovered diamonds.

But though this random list does not exhaust the inconsistencies in the prophecy of this modern anthropology by far, let it suffice. This school would have been laughed out of court had it not spoken a jargon which strove to indicate profundity of scientific investigation; had its contentions not worn verbal semblance to the Darwinian shibboleths. Why, did the finds of this school not replace by certainty the wild guesses of their groping predecessors? Now we know, antagonism and antipathy of races is the propelling force of the ages: the pathos and tragedy of the Jew's fate is involved in his own racial elements. He is a Semite; yet he presumes to home among Aryans. He challenges the instinctive aversion of his hosts and passive antipathy naturally ferments into purposed aggression. The Aryan exercises his right divine to the supremacy by virtue of his racial superiority. Of inferior mould and texture, the Semite cannot expect to be shown quarter in this relentless combat. In war, all is fair. The law of self-preservation justifies the Aryan in whatever measures he takes to protect his endangered superiority. If repression does not hold the Semite in check and deportation is not feasible then extermination must be resorted to. Inspect a leaf under a microscope, you behold a battlefield. Does stronger insect there show pity to weaker parasite? Look at a drop of water when un-

der the magnifying lens. Numerous armies are marshalled and marching against one another. It is war unto death which runs its course to the pitiless survival of the stronger. The universe is under martial law. The human races are subject to it as well. Theirs is unceasing contest for supremacy. The inferior must go to the wall. The superior has the right to impose its conditions on the vanquished "Vae victis!" Who may help this? Why inveigh against the inevitable? As certain species of animals have become extinct, so certain races of men are doomed to disappear. Which they be, is dependent on the issue of the raging conflict The weaker are foreordained to annihilation. That the stronger take measures to shorten the agony, is highest wisdom on their part. The brutalism of Anti-Semitism was thus justified in the brutalism of naturalistic anthropology.

If survival predicates superiority, the Jew's title to this distinction is without flaw. He has survived, notwithstanding the terrible odds against him. But when the Jew presents this credential to the tribunal that in all of its decisions has upheld the doctrine he discovers that these philosophic judges forget their own theories the moment the Jew is suitor at the bar. They who have made the struggle for supremacy pivotal in their dogmatics; they who have maintained that in the pursuit of that ambition all is fair; they who have ruled that morality is an irrelevant and with Nietzsche canonized strength as a law unto itself to which the slaves' standards of good and evil do not apply; now confronted with the evidence that the inferiority of the Jew is negatived by the irrefutable fact of his survival being to talk of the Jew's easier conscience,

looser morality which enables him to outwit the Aryan more delicately fibred and more scrupulously attentive to the sanctifications of the moral code. The Jew would lay the world under tribute, say they, as though by their own creed this purpose were not sanctioned as the dominant impulse of human action. To accomplish this design, according to them, he resorts to immoral trickery, as though they had not time and again proclaimed that under martial law whatever promises the defeat of the opponent was permitted. In one word, with brazen effrontery they stigmatize the Jew as a moral parasite, and then revert to their so far forgotten naturalistic premise to draw the conclusion that parasites must be exterminated with vitriol, and acids, with torch and fire if must be.

This Naturalistic Racialism influenced mightily the nationalism which swept over the world in the wake of Germany's victorious resurrection. Instead of recognizing in nationality a spiritual unity, the outflow of ages of trials and triumphs shared in common and of hopes cherished in unison, the new nationalism would base it on physical facts. Identity of racial extraction conditioned, limited the scope of natural inclusion. The Jew being of non-Teutonic, non-Gallic, non-Slavonic extraction was an intruder, an alien. Even medieval nations had not dared go these lengths. They had insisted on unity of religion. Lest the new nations be behind the old, the nationalists evolved a new theory. Somehow Christianity was posited as the flower of Teutonic Aryanism. German and Christian were declared interchangeable terms. On the tree of Teutonic-Celtic Aryanism grew the fruit of Christianity. Jesus was not a Semite. Semites, not Christians, could not be

Germans. Only orthodox Christians could be Russians. Nations could not admit foreigners to equality with their own. Hence the Jew, a mere and always unpleasant guest must be subjected to special laws. It is no compliment for Jews that the political Zionists have adopted virtually all the tenets of our enemies, the modern nationalists, agreeing with them that Jews are not entitled to regard themselves as of the German or Russian nation as long as they do not relinquish their Judaism.

Naturalistic and nationalistic anti-Semitism found the way blazed for its brutal gospel by the ruling constructors of Manchester economics. Competition had been deified by the industrialism and commercialism of the age of factories even before Darwin had construed strife and struggle to be the impelling force of the evolutionary process. The omnipotence and benevolence of this Fetish having been detected to be illusory, efforts in the last decades of the Nineteenth century have been concentrated on reducing the number of the competitors that the slice of the pie might be larger for the remaining fewer beneficiaries of the distribution. Keep the snouts of as many hungry swines out of the trough, they who are admitted will grow all the fatter. The proposition was self-evident. The anti-Semite at once took on the mask of a benefactor. His program was to exterminate or expatriate the Jews. These Jews were eager competitors. With them out of the way, the share of others could not but be proportionately increased.

It is plain that modern naturalism and commercialism have been the parents and abettors of anti-Semitism. The massacres of Russia are the logical, practical

carrying into effect of their principles. You may object that the Rusian mob knew but little of and cared still less for the philosophy of anti-Semitic nationalism. Who knows the story of epidemics remembers how easily germs of infection travel. It seems also wonderful that the raindrop cradled in the clouds should find its way to the distant ocean and that, too, at times along channels in the interior of the mountains hidden from the eye of beholders. When it bursts forth through crag at the foot of the rock none would suspect that it had drilled its way through the stone. But it has. At all events the accursed instigators of the Russian mob's frenzy have sat at the feet of our modern anthropologists, nationalists and economists. In the arguments and fallacies of these, the bloodhounds of the Tzar had the brief justifying their policy. They knew themselves safe from protest and contempt at the hand of their neighbors. These were devotees to the same creed as were they.

Had anti-Semitism leaning on naturalism and in league with modern nationalism and economics never been articulated, the Russian eruption would never have singled out the Jews as almost the sole victims of the volcano's devouring passion. From Renan's book on the genius of the Semitic languages, the intellectual sponsor of later anti-Semitism, to the brutality of the Russian fiends, seems a far cry. But, alas! the connection is undeniable. Though Renan later did his utmost to demonstrate that Jews are not Hebrews, his essay gave the signal for this baiting of so-called Semites. The epidemic spreading took on virulence through its very raging. The Stoeckers, Duhrings, Chamberlains, Goldwin Smiths, the Luegers and Delitzschs are

the virtual murderers of the 15,000 martyrs that fell into the clutches of the butchers in that hell of injustice, the Pale, reveling and rioting in blood and pillage as never had done human beings before.

In the last analysis this "Vulcanic" eruption is a frightful illustration of the prolific and pernicious consequences of an erroneous theory once given wing. The philosophy of materialism wedded to fallacious and specious ethnology begot the bastard that nurtured by selfish economics and counterfeit nationalism could not but join to the insolence of his parents cohabitating in unholy though congenial concubinage the brutality of his nurses. The Russian Mujic is ignorant of the theories that cradled and coddled his conduct. They who encouraged and instigated his barbarities are not. In these damnable doctrines of which they are adepts even when bowing to Ikon and carrying candles at the Greek Orthodox ceremonial they hold the warrant for their intrigue. From that Upas tree rooted in hatred, envy, malice, falsehood, libeled in the catalogue of human poisonous plantings as anti-Semitism was carried by the winds to darkest Russia the anther-dust, which shed from the lobes of materialism, nationalism and egotism pollinated the receptive brutalism and bestiality of the besotted analphabets of the Tzar's Empire. In this new horrible slaughter of the innocent we behold how the teachings that strength is law unto itself work out in application. And still we would lay to our bosom the conceit that ours is an age of civilization; that the Messianic fulfillment is here; that there is no call for the Jew with his insistence on right to the discomfiture of might, his historic duty to protest against the idolatry of selfishness, the fetichism of

wealth, even to the point where the martyr's stake is our reward. Can we not read the signs?

Indeed, the graphic descriptions of Babylon's fate and doom in our Biblical selection anticipate every detail of Russia's disorganization in these latter days. The despoiler has been despoiled. Tyrants of ancient terrors in the netherworld are ashamed to fellowship with the minions of Russian cruelty. Autocracy has crumbled into the dust writing the story of its fall in the crimson script of blood and shame. Above all human might rules a holy Will indulging the despots of earth for a while but requiting their presumption with unfailing destruction. Shall we not be warned? The line between social and brutal anti-Semitism is very thin. Both are children of one household. Both are warmed at the hell fires of materialism, plutocratic arrogance, pseudo-patriotism. The Jew must not be a materialist even if all the world bows the knee before this most hideous of all hideous Molochs. In his dealings with men, his polestar must be other than success at whatever price of character and virtue. Let others dance around the golden calf if they will. Twenty years more of these orgies of frenzied finance, of trusts violated, of wealth madness and our country may perhaps have to rue its folly as Russia does its today. Shall our streets, too, run with blood? The Jew shall never be a moneytheist for his it is to be the uncompromising monotheist. Yet if the Jew proves faithless, upon him—this is the solemn emphasis of his history—falls the retributive blow of the disappointed, the demented, first and most fatally. Can we then afford to neglect our synagogues, be deaf to the appeals of Prophets because some of us have succeeded in

amassing profits? A Judaism which is no more than racial aloofness provokes racial distrust; a Judaism which is tainted by plutocratic materialism is a challenge to materialistic brutalism. Only a Judaism that endeavors to activize the prophetic vision of social righteousness is loyal to its mission. It will be a blessing. If martyr honors are assigned it by Providence, the shame of having misled others along the paths leading to perdition does then not multiply its tears. Friends, our lives consecrated to the right, our ideals resplendent in the glory of righteousness and justice triumphant, must be the antidote to materialism, nationalism, brutalism, the Satanic sources of the maelstrom of anti-Semitism. Amen.

Myth; Miracle and Midrash

A DISCOURSE
BY
EMIL G. HIRSCH

THE REFORM ADVOCATE
BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS
204 DEARBORN STREET. - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

The Reform Advocate

Published Weekly

In the Interest of Reform Judaism

DR. E. G. HIRSCH, Editor

With Contributions by the Ablest Jewish Writers

Subscription Price $2.00 Per Annum

Sample Copies Gratis

BLOCH & NEWMAN

Publishers

204 Dearborn St., Chicago

MYTH, MIRACLE AND MIDRASH

Goethe tells us that "das Wunder its des Glaubens liebstes Kind." In the spirit of his times and a true exponent of their philosophy he insists that the miracles recorded in the ancient documents of the synagogue and the church partake of the character of free inventions. According to his theory which is even at the present day shared by many, they have sprung from the prolific womb of faith. He inverts, as is easily seen, the commonly defended doctrine which would have faith rest on miracles. He suggests, therefore, the thought that miracles cannot corroborate the contentions of faith, but that the acceptance of miracles presupposes the dominant influence of faith. Undoubtedly this view is the truer. In Lessing's Nathan the same construction reappears in the dialogue between the titular figure of the play and his foster daughter. She maintains that her rescue was wrought through the invention of an angel sent by God on this errand. The wiser mind of the maturer and far-traveled man sees through her conceit. He detects in it the fruitage of her nurse's training. Had she not been taught to believe in the existence of angelic mediators, her escape from the greed of fire would not have impressed her as the direct interference willed by God. It is his calm confidence that the greatest miracle and wonder is that the mighty manifestations of wondrous power by which we are surrounded everywhere become so familiar to us as to lose for us the import of the miraculous.

Nathan's thesis carries, indeed, a telling point. Just now, when in the full flush of our wealth of intimate communications with nature we are apt to overlook the unyielding limitations of our knowledge of nature's fundamentals, the caution uttered by the high-priest of religious tolerance might with profit be laid to our heart.

It is not true that the sciences have lifted the curtain of mystery from off the face of creation. The wisest among us is at his best imprisoned on an island of no wide area, surrounded on all sides by an ocean screened by impenetrable banks of fog. The beating of the tide upon the shore, and driftwood cast up from the unseen immensity beyond, encourage the imagination intent upon construing from a few fragments the plan of the unexplored waste; but more than such provisional because anticipatory vision into hidden things and currents even the bold sciences of the present day do not vouchsafe to never so devoted a courtier of their secrets. If mystery be the groundwork upon which faith builds its altars, and unexplored depths invite its miracle-fed assurance, there is not the least excuse for holding that the exact sciences have put an end to the dominion of religion, or closed forever the portals of its wonder palace. The clear thinker has no doubts that the sciences themselves have resort to faith as intently as have the creeds of the world. Matter and force, the conservation of energy, atom and molecule and molecular affinities; the very hypothesis of evolution through natural selection; the genesis of life and the production of thought, the chemical substratum of consciousness and similar concepts or operations which are the stock phrases and familiar contentions of modern scientific reasoning, are, if examined to their ultimate elements, airy, thought-

woven assumptions of the human mind. The sciences presuppose as vital an imagination as does faith; they make as heavy drafts upon the store of our credulity as does the *credo* or the metaphysics of the church, the synagogue, and the mosque.

But religion to be true to her mission in these days of growing knowledge cannot bar her territory against the inroads of reason. Reason is indeed unable to explain all that presses upon our curiosity with the demand for an account of its rise and development, of its purpose or destiny. "There are more things between heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." But the irrepressible passion resident in the breast of man for an harmonious interpretation of the universe and of life will not admit that two conflicting and mutually contradictory theories purporting both to hold the key to the unread arcana or the known facts of nature and fate, can be both true. Modern thought has convinced itself of the truth that the world is under the dominion of law. Order and regularity of sequence between cause and effect are the postulates of the assumption that one law reigns in the heights and in the depths. The suspension of that law for whatever end in view would not be evidence of omniscience or omnipotence. Thinkers have no difficulty to establish this proposition.

An all-wise Creator must have foreseen in the hour of the creation the future necessities calling for the modification of the general law; if he did not possess this insight he cannot be credited with omniscience. But if he had this anticipatory knowledge of the insufficiency of his general and ordinary provisions and nevertheless neglected to so amend them that at the proper crisis they would respond spontaneously to the emergency, his

only alternative left is the denial of omnipotence to the creative energy. On either horn of the dilemma the belief in miracles suffers irreparable and fatal havoc. A God who cannot foresee that his original laws will not operate to carry out his intentions under all circumstances lacks omniscience; a God who foreseeing this defect cannot so arrange his work as to meet the future emergency lacks omnipotence. The appeal to God's omnipotence for which there is neither limitation nor impossibility cannot be admitted in rebuttal. For inherent in our idea of God is the necessity of His acting reasonably. Our God cannot be swayed by whim or caprice. The supreme law-giver is himself under the law. Law and liberty are not mutually exclusive. Slavery involves obedience to a law which is contrary to our highest nature. Liberty roots in compliance with the law which corresponds to the essential exposition of our own being. Compulsion is absent in freedom, not so the voluntary and spontaneous execution of the inherent necessities under which our life to be complete must be lived.

In God there is law and freedom, in Him both are identical. A lawless God is inconceivable. The omnipotence of God is not of one fibre with its popular misconception which makes it the equivalent of the license to do according to unrestricted pleasure. An all-powerful God will not and cannot turn water into wine or suspend the operation of the law of gravitation. *"Ha-Yad Adhonay tikzar?"* is, if adduced to decide this problem, at once answered by every one who understands what the philosophical concept of the deity implies, in the negative. God cannot undo and deny himself. The very implications of the idea of God reject this possibility as not within the range of his power. Being the

lawgiver he is himself under his own law. The good old Talmudists so often misunderstood and undervalued, especially by such as know of them and their thoughts only from hearsay, had already this appreciation of the implications inherent in the God-idea. Much fun has been poked at them for having discussed the to us more than empty question whether God observes the minutiæ of the rabbinical ritual code, and for having indulged in the to them by no means fanciful descriptions of God studying the law in accordance with the approved canons of rabbinical disputations and wearing the prescribed phylacteries. Eisenmenger and his followers both among the non-Jews and the Jews have not been slow to call attention to these well-nigh blasphemous vagaries and exuberances of rabbinical impudence as they chose to style them. But to my mind these Haggadic speculations betray on the part of their authors a deep appreciation of the philosophic thought that God as the giver of the law is by the very essence of his Godhood inherently bound by that law. This throws a new light on the oft-quoted but only rarely correctly apprehended "nomistic" character of the rabbis' God-idea.

But be this as it may, certain it is that Judaism in all of its phases attributed little if any evidential force to miracles. The attentive reader of the old law bearing on the credit to be given a claimant of prophetic powers will recall without much difficulty proof abundant to this fact. The "Torah is not in heaven and it is not beyond the sea." In the decisions of disputed rabbinical applications of the law, supernatural signs and portents played no part. They were rejected. This is clearly shown in the well-known passage (Baba Metzia 59 b) where the experience of Rabbi Elieser is recorded, who, thrice appealing to miraculous phenomena which

he provoked, found his contentions none the less emphatically rejected by the assembled teachers. Even the heavenly voice "Bath Kol" was not accorded a vote in that court. Of course, the Biblical record remembers a multitude of miraculous happenings. The rabbinical writings are in turn not poor in stories of men who exercised what we may call miraculous control over the stores of nature. The rabbinical Rip-Van-Winkle 'Honiah, the "circle-man," is probably well known to even you as the commander of the clouds. But the rabbis felt the difficulties unavoidably involved in the assumption of an arbitrary interference on the part of God with the laws of creation, and in order to dull their edge taught that whatever is chronicled as such came to pass in obedience to a condition imposed in the very act of creation. The Red Sea, for instance, was *in the beginning* so constituted as to divide before the fleeing host of Israel when Moses lifted up his staff. Jonah's fish was created with the destiny to save the truant fugitive from God's commission (Tan'hum Toldoth Noah). In this way the rabbis obviated the dilemma analyzed above. The miracle ceased, in fact, to be a miracle; the event occurred in consequence of a fore-ordained natural law. The law of nature was not suspended nor violated. One who is acquainted with much of the latest Christian literature on this mooted matter knows that in taking this position the teachers of the rabbinical school anticipated the reasoning of the most modern spokesmen and writers on apologetics in what is called the new orthodoxy in church circles.

The esteem in which workers of miracles were held by the rabbis was not of a very high order (Sabbath 53). Even pious 'Honia was rebuked by Simon b. Sheta'h for misleading the people (Ta'anith 23). Throughout Tal-

mudic and also the later philosophical writings of the Middle Ages the tendency is clearly indicated to find wherever possible a natural explanation for the miracles or to interpret them as allegories. Abarbanel, for instance, does not scruple to say that the story of Jonah's lodging in the fish's belly was a dream which the prophet had. Such stories as represent God's appearance to men in the guise of an angel, a human being, a devouring fire, or seated on a wonderfully splendid throne, were held to have originated in the imagination of the beholder, (Jebhamoth, 49 b., Maimonides Moreh II, 43; Yesodhe Hattorah I, 9; and Einhorn Ner Tamid, p. 13.) In Albo's *Ikkarim* (III, 8) the incident of the burning bush is explained on this basis. And when the old interpreters failed in this manner to naturalize or allegorize the Biblical story they sometimes would indicate their doubt in an unmistakable manner. (See Yoma 54, b.) Not to lose myself in a haystack of quotations, I must forego further citations from our mediæval authorities. One statement, however, by Maimonides deserves to be recalled. He emphasizes the fact that according to our religion never can a miracle affect the moral nature of man. Catastrophical conversions in consequence of sudden marvelous illumination are therefore excluded. And this is a distinction which Jewish orthodoxy when contemplating Christian revivalism may well accentuate. On still another point Maimonides is equally strenuous. The laws of nature are permanent. Never by miracle is the fundamental order of creation interrupted.

But what is our attitude? Do we belong to the blind and unquestioning believers that accept the written word of the Biblical stories without inquiry; or shall we range ourselves under the banner of the rationalists; or

reject the stories as idle if not intriguing inventions palmed off for purposes of a questionable moral nature upon a credulous people; or shall we hold that these stories are fundamentally the productions of minds incapable of recording what they saw because diseased and subject to hallucinations? For all of these widely variant assumptions defenders have arisen both within and without the household of Israel. Believers who ask not and inquire not, notwithstanding the better example set to them by the old teachers of the rabbinical times whose words I have in part quoted, are by no means in the minority among the present day Jews. For, bear in mind, it is absolute folly to hold that we American Jews constitute the preponderating party and have therefore the right to maintain that what we declare to be the tenets of modern Judaism has universal currency as such.

Those who would excommunicate one or the other congregation for what they choose to denominate its heresis, might have a care lest others visit the same fate upon their head. If questions of orthodox belief must be submitted to the arbitrament of the census, every one is bound to concede that the belief in miracles is an article of faith in modern Israel. Those who accept whatever story the Bible may contain as literally true, to doubt which would be blasphemy, exceed in numbers by far those who are inclined to modify this literalism. We shall not relinquish our right to think. As we read the story of our religion's gowth we believe ourselves entitled to this prerogative. For according to our apprehension of the genius of Judaism we deem liberty of thought its distinguishing and vital attribute. Many of the greatest of its teachers have exercised this privilege, and have thus blazed the path for others that would

tread in their footsteps. We cannot for reasons already explained allow that miracles, however well attested, prove anything. Our belief in God and our interpretation of His nature is of too high an order and too reverent a spirit to dethrone him and make him the occupant of the low station of a tinker. His creation was perfect from the beginning, his laws self-given, adequate. Miracles would detract from his majesty. Their acceptance implies less of God-belief than their rejection. We, therefore, reject them.

But we are withal not of one mind with the numerous would-be wise, who calmor that the Bibilical stories are silhouettes cut out by men of unsound mind. The marvelous representations of happenings are not free inventions. Nor are they reports of actual occurrences embellished wickedly for some selfish purpose or innocently in order to point a moral lesson, by some recorder or deceiver. This is indeed the view of rationalists of whatever variety. Some of their clan have thought of saving the letter of the story by disrobing it of its poetry. That Moses wrought the deeds reported of him they never doubt. He turned a staff into a serpent, he divided the Red Sea, he smote the rock and drew therefrom water. But, say they, while the people of Pharoah were misled by appearances to credit him with supernatural powers, and therefore were induced to listen to his words, in reality he performed his tricks in a perfectly natural manner. His staff was of the order of prepared tools which masters of the art of sleight of hand know how to handle to good effect; he had studied the natural phenomena of Egypt's river; he had observed that at a definite period of the year the father of the country, the Nile, carried in its muddy embrace large quantities of the red sand swept from off the

Abyssinian mountains, and relying upon this annual flow of ruddy slime he utilized the first appearance thereof to frighten Pharoah into the illusion that the Nile's waters had been turned into blood. Jacob did not wrestle with an angel, no, his antagonist in that memorable night was a disguised robber. The first-born in Egypt were not slain by the angel of death making his saddening rounds at the unsprinkled doors of Pharaoh's subject, no, they fell a victim to the cruelty of Arab tribes whom Moses had hired to carry out his final threat hurled into the stubborn king's teeth.

In this wise, rationalism attempted to save the credibility of the Bible. If the holy writings of Israel can escape rejection as historical records only by such heroic treatment as this, had they not better court extinction? They would certainly save their dignity and that of their great heroes. Here Moses is reduced to the role of a mountebank, a deceiver, a murderer. What asinine creatures must they have been who were "taken in" by such cheap tricks as these. Had Pharoah never seen the Nile run red with Abyssinian sands? If Moses had, the king certainly had observed the phenomenon as well. And how did the Arabs know in their pillaging incursion which of the inhabitants happened to be the first-born? Did they stop to insist upon seeing the birth certificate, or did they cross-examine the mothers in order to establish the primogeniture of their victims? These and a thousand similar questions might be put to show how bunglingly the rationalist proceeds to save the letter of the Bible. The attitude of the honest believer is at least reverential, that of the rationalist frivolous beyond sufferance. Religion and the Bible both might exclaim: May a good Lord preserve us against such

friends, of our enemies we shall be able to take care unaided.

Less flippant and less arrogant than this species of self-admiring rationalists, but equally unscholarly and unbearable is that variety of theirs that never tires of contending that with intentions of either a good or an evil kind Moses and the other writers of the Biblical accounts misrepresented as marvelous, simple natural occurrences though they knew in their hearts of hearts that their description did not do justice to the events. The difference between this and the former set of rationalists lies in the admission that the fraud upon others is perpetrated not in the act of performance so much as in the posterior proclamation thereof. Nevertheless under this view Moses is a deceiver. He "makes God speak" and "leads the people to believe that God has spoken," when he knows that he himself is the author of the laws which he has proclaimed as divine. It is true he does not perform his circus pranks before Pharoah, but the waiting people outside are told by him that a serpent had been turned into a staff and vice versa. This method of explaining the miracles as afterthoughts of the writers who report them has very justly lost all cast and standing today in the forum of science and scholarship. We may safely leave it to its well earned rest. In Germany no seriously minded person will do it so much honor as to remember it, though with us now and then a fossil of this extinct order may expose its nudity in open daylight.

Still another sect of rationalists deserves a passing word. More earnest than its predecessors along these dusty roads of forced interpretations under the mistaken belief that the painful effort will save the Bible and also do justice to the insistences of reason, this lat-

ter day variation of the school imputes no immoral or questionable motives to the Biblical reporters. It would have the stories pass as accounts of real occurrences. But what of the miraculous they appear to carry, is traced to the occult treacheries of the human brain. Dreams, hallucinations, autohypnotic processes are charged with having produced the effects which moulding the temper and modifying the outlook of the recorder forced his pen into grooves ignored by the sober-minded. The voices which the prophet claims to have heard were in so far real as he in his state of exaltation actually and honestly heard them; the waters actually oozed out of the rock, but the intense anxiety of the thirsting people blinded their eye to the fact that Moses had no part in the opening of the hidden spring. From the subjective point of view of the authors, the event took place exactly as they described it. They were not false to the truth as they saw it when they ascribed ordinary happenings to the intervention of supernatural power.

It requires no long explanation to prove that this new phase of rationalism has caught a few whiffs of the spirit of modern methods and results. The subjective element certainly has played a part in the coloring of old documents and their contents. The prophetic idiosyncrasy roots to a large extent in the regions of the subconscious. Nor is it to be disputed that for many of the Biblical stories there is the basis of actual fact. But these admissions do not cover the whole field. There are limitations to the applicability of these factors. To reduce the experience of Jonah to the precipitate of a dream will neglect the palpable certainty that the book which bears the prophet's name is itself a parable into which has been worked one of the class of

legends that are known as wanderers. The jewel casket of many a nation's folklore exhibits this very gem; under many a clime and in many a tongue the fable is rehearsed of a singer or sage who escaped a watery grave by the kindness of a finny denizen of the deep. The framework of the Biblical story deserves no greater credit for correspondence with an actual occurrence than do the sister saga's of other climes. And if mental processes to which the brain lends itself in moments of intense excitement throw all the light which we desire and can get on the mystery of the prophetic gift, we lose the discriminating moment to distinguish the true prophet from his namesake serving Baal.

The seers whose words have aroused the ages and still have not ceased stirring the conscience of even our day, drew their inexhaustible power indeed from other sources than the potency to dream or to invite visions. Theirs was an insight not so much into the hidden mysteries of unexplored nature as into the depths of human passion, the motives of human conduct, the relations that should subsist between man and man. Theirs was not merely the wealth of subjective illusions frequent and universal indeed in the days when the lines between the personal and the impersonal, the natural and the supernatural were as yet not definitely established. No, they were not wonder-workers, and their message depended not for its vital importance upon the corroborating testimony of uncanny and weird inversions of the usual sequence of natural happenings. They were messengers of righteousness, their burning words carried in their own fire the credentials of a truth which to deny implies the denial of man's dominant and central position among the things created. Of the earlier prophets,—

shadowy outlines of pushing energies in days of stress and strain rather than warm-blooded and high-towering personalities,—miracles are indeed recorded. Elijah and Elisha appear in the annals of the people's traditions as men of supreme control over life and grave.

To rationalize about these heroic figures will not save their historic character while it will reduce to weak prose the strong poetry of their biographies. Nature hates a vacuum, so does history. The vast ranges of time of which no definite person can be made the sponsor, centuries, however and generally under the strain of ideas and conflicts that in their outcome affect most vitally all future days, tradition loves to populate with one or two strong individualities in whose life and labor are crystalized the aspirations of their generation travailing in the birth-throes of the nobler faith. Such personalities may indeed be elaborations of actual men of flesh and blood who walked and worked on earth. An Elijah may have lived, but if he did he was not the giant, the figure of whom popular tradition has carved less out of the rude stone of the hero's real life than out of the finer marble of the new nation's and the new religion's and the new love's incipient strength which during the period covered by the magnified hero's life began to take form and assume influence. Such figures representing vital movements are always clothed by popular fancy with the purple of supernatural rulership. Israel's chronicles are not the only ones that exhibit this tendency. It is the universal phenomenon, in Greece and Rome no less than in India and the Northlands.

For religion and certainly for our religion the question of the actuality and the historicity of the Biblical miracles and the Biblical miracle workers is inconse-

quential. Religion does not depend upon facts, it is itself the stupendous and supreme fact. Even if miracles had the force of proving the divinity of him who performs them, a force which they have not, Judaism abhorring the confusion between the supremely divine and the human in the sense that God has ever assumed body and form, is not interested in the vindication of the truth as history of whatever report of miracles the documents contain. Significant in this connection is the catalogue of heresies which some of the authorities of rabbinical theology have taken pains to register. In none of them do we find the suggestion that rejection of miracles will bar the way to the enjoyments of honors in the gift of the religious community.

And we have warrant most ample for the proposition that rabbinical interpreters were exceedingly free in their treatment of Biblical miracles. Maimonides and others insist upon the acceptance of the doctrine of creation out of nothing, the recognition of prophecy, or as we probably might say revelation, and the belief in the resurrection of the dead. The first and the last in rabbinical argumentation are virtually one. The God who creates by the power of his word, reason the doctors of the school, has certainly the power to recreate the body crumbled into dust. A study of Maimonides' theory of prophecy will show without much straining of points that the great master had notions which are not very far removed from naturalism, certainly much nearer to it than to supernaturalism.

It goes without saying that our theology has progressed beyond that of Maimonides or other mediæval authorities. We have no scruple to reject the belief in the miracle of the resurrection; our doctrine concerning *creatio ex nihilo* is a postulate of our concept of the

deity and not the outcome of our belief in the cosmogeny of Genesis. There would thus remain for us only the miracle of revelation or prophecy. It is true in our pulpits the word revelation is by no means a stranger. They that use it are doing so in the full knowledge of the fact that they connote therewith an idea *toto coelo* different from that which would have it stand for the ONE event associated in Biblical history with Sinai. Truth is, indeed, not of the dust. He who finds it feels that he has had but little part in its discovery. In this sense the word revelation may apply without too much violence to the unfolding of truth in Israel through the mediation of those men of religious genius whom we have come to designate as the prophets. In any other sense however, we do not accept the theory that religion is based on revelation. How so a cosmic God with whom to associate human form was even declared by Maimonides to be blasphemy can enter into a mechanical communication with Moses and descend to speak with him on earth is certainly beyond the limits of our comprehension. The ancient philosophers of Judaism felt this difficulty. The possession of a voice presupposes the existence of a body to produce sound. God having no body can have no voice. For this reason it was assumed that the channel through which God's words flowed to earth was a voice created especially for this service.

Rabbi Jose (Sukkah 5, a) contends that Moses never ascended to heaven and God never descended to earth. Though in the subsequent halakhic discussion this statement is modified to prove a point of interest in the fixations of the dimensions of the ritually correct tabernacle, the boldness of the teacher's utterance evidences the flexible character of the doctrine of mechanical rev-

lation. And none can be blind to the significance of the rabbinical provision against the adoption of what they declared arch-heresy, the doctrine that the Decalogue had the sanction of revelation in a higher degree than any other part of the law. (Berakhoth 12.) Revelation as a mechanical process would indeed be a miracle and as such as ineffective to prove truth as any other marvelous occurrence. If the human mind is able to grasp the truth revealed, revelation is unnecessary; if the human mind lacks this power, revelation is to no purpose. Pedagogical psychology understands full well that instruction to be effective can only consist in rational guidance of the productive functions of the mind. What the mind is unable to produce no teaching can impart. It might as well be mere sound and will have as much power to affect men and their conduct as mere sound would have. Biblical history corroborates this experience of sound pedagogy. Israel moulds the golden calf immediately after the proclamation of the second commandment. For all practical purposes Sinai might have remained silent. Lessing's view of the function of revelation as an accelerated process of origination through instruction might save the general doctrine if we were not constrained to ask what the Sinaitic revelation contained that had not been known before its occurrence, or that some other nations though not the recipients of the divine message from on high were left in ignorance of.

Abraham, if we must believe the Biblical documents, was a monotheist; so was Moses. The great patriarch's monotheism is regarded by the rabbinical authorities as the outflow of his own reasoning. (Maimonides Hilkhoth Akkum I, 3.) If he could arrive at this truth without mechanical revelation, why should others re-

quire the supernatural instruction? The Greek thinkers and writers of the fourth century are clearly entitled to be classed among monotheists. Confucius emphasized the moral precepts contained in the two tables as strenuously as they did, and so did the Egyptian book of the dead. It would then appear that the proclamation of the Decalogue on Sinai was, as far as the people to whom it was addressed were concerned, bootless, and as far as other nations come into consideration, a work of superarrogation. And which of the versions of the Decalogue was the one which threw the mountain into spasms? Can we seriously take refuge in the assumption that the fourth commandment was in its two-fold form proclaimed in the one and the same breath?

It has been argued that upon the Decalogue as revealed rest the notions of right which civilization has everywhere adopted and which will dissolve at once should we conclude that Moses did not receive the two tables in the manner outlined in holy Scripture. This argument is the weakest of the many weak ones to bolster up an untenable because irrational theory. The Biblical account of the first murder assumes that Cain feels his guilt. Without revelation he was aware of the crime involved in his act. The "sons of Noah" are certainly before the proclamation of the Sinaitic law by all rabbinical theologians represented as under moral obligations. An original revelation to Adam cannot be read into the Biblical texts. (Confer against Sanhedrin 56 b. Na'hmanides on Lev. XVIII.) The Romans had a clear and comprehensive "Rechtsbegriff" though they did not know of the (hypothetical) existence of the God-given law. And moreover are the principles of right enunciated in the Decalogue not barely formal and rudimentary? Thou shalt not murder, gives us no

information on what the law covers. Savage tribes may also accept the principle but construe it to have no applicability to the member of a foreign community. In fact the Pentateuch itself is forced to reckon with the institution of blood revenge. The bare enunciation of this law does not furnish us a sufficient basis of right. Nor does the Decalogue tell us what property is; it leaves us in the lurch when we would know what to consider adultery. Polygamy flourished after the proclamation of the Decalogue; this is proof that the empty prohibition of adultery was very far from spreading the foundations of absolute law which is, we suppose, what Dr. Wise means when speaking of the "Rechtsbegriff."

Or shall we restrict our view of revelation to the operation of the divine element in the prophets? Consulting the Talmudic authorities one cannot but hold that these teachers of our religion allowed a wide latitude of opinion on this moot point. The personal character of the recipient of prophetic power is by no means a negative factor. Purity of life, fear of sin are said to lead to the outpouring of the "holy spirit." (J. Sabbath I, 3; Shir ha-Shirim Rabba editio 1554, 3 a.) Teachers of the Torah are credited with the possession of the holy spirit. That the individual disposition and conditions of the prophets modify the manifestations of this "divine element" is a ready concession in rabbinical exegesis. (Confer Sanhedrin 89, a; 'Hagiga 13, b.) Men like Rabbi 'Helbo, reporting an utterance of R. Jochanan, and R. Simeon b. Lakish, had no very high opinion of prophecy, and, in fact, wisdom was considered to represent a higher stage of religious illumination than the prophetic vision. (Midrash Ekha Rabba; Sabbath 119, b.)

In accordance with Biblical precedent Moses is as-

signed an exceptional station among the prophets by the rabbis. And yet when we analyze their views on the channels through which Moses received the revealing message, we cannot but conclude that they inclined very strongly to the opinion that his own mind was the constituting and determinating factor of the revelation of which he was the mouth-piece. (Maimonides, Yesodhe Hattorah VII, 6; Ibn Esra to Num. VII; Siphri to Lev. I, 1).

As Judaism never accepted Tertullian's *credible est quia ineptum est,* the miracle of revelation even cannot be elevated to a plane higher than that to be assigned to others. Truth is truth no matter how enunciated, when and where and by whom. Twice two equals four, no divine voice can change the result or lend additional verity to the statement. That the square erected on the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle equals the sum of squares of the other two sides remains true without revelation and cannot be vitiated by never so solemn a divine proclamation of the contrary.

Right is right under all circumstances, and if man is unable to distinguish between right and wrong without revelation he will be as incompetent after its intervention. For the human mind can only act upon motives which lie within the sphere of its own cognition. Such motives and the standards by which to judge them the human mind can either always grasp of its own strength, or it cannot grasp them at all, and in this case not act upon them. Nor can God be proven by revelation. Either the God-idea lies within the range of the human mind's possibilities, and then revelation is unnecessary, or it does not, and then revelation will not bring us one inch nearer to its comprehension so as to make it a vital force in our life and thought.

Moreover, if miracles prove truth, every form of religion is by virtue of such corroboration entitled to be held true. For every religion claims by its documents, or in the belief of its devotees, to be of divine origin. Of every religious teacher the working of miracles is recorded. And these are as well authenticated as are those of which the Bible has the record. Moses and Jesus, Mohammed and Buddah, not to mention others, are credited with the performance of identical operations. To say that those remembered of Moses are more trustworthy than others is not admissible. For recent literary researches in the history of religious tradition have established beyond the possibility of cavil the fact that none of the Old Testament historical books are the children of the times of which they purport to give us a detailed account. Even if we would agree to the proposition of Maimonides that the miracles wrought by Moses are in so far more credible than those of the prophets after him, since they were performed in the plain sight of eye-witnesses, we should have to relinquish the argument in view of the indisputable circumstance that none of our documents is contemporaneous with the men supposed to have been eye-witnesses.

Judaism as a religion has no concern with the efforts to save as authentic the Biblical stories. We may without fear of endangering the foundations of our faith subject the old documents, children of religion and not its parents, as as they are, to the processes of analysis which furnish us an insight into the architecture and character of the Homeric poems or the Vedic hymns or the composition of the Koran. Under the lens of the critic, miracle will appear to belong to the region of myth.

Says Dr. Einhorn, "The miracles which the Biblical books describe as far as they are not memories of natural occurrences belong to the territory of legend. (Ner Tamid, p. 37.)" Myth, said Hegel, is of all true statements of truth the truest. If it does not tell us what has happened, it informs us what should have happened, if certain principles are the determinants of the universe. With but slight modification we may admit this dictum of the bold German dialectician. Indeed, they are strangers even in the anti-chamber of the human soul's workshop who believe that myth and untruth are exchangeable terms. No myth is a free invention unless it be of that class of myths which are called secondary. Whenever a myth is the original outburst of a people's thought, it is the irresistible utterance of the people's poetic apperception of the events which it estimates to be of vital import in its own destiny; when it recites the story of a personal life, as often it does, it is the reflection of the people's highest ambitions, or the reconstruction of its own life in the form of an individual trial or triumph.

The myths or miracles in the New Testament are indeed, to a great extent, secondary or derivative. That Elijah and Moses are virtually one and the same personal precipitate of the nation's reconstructive poetry, of the nation's constructive period, the Talmudists have already detected. They enumerate nearly one hundred similarities of event and performance in the recorded biographies of these two pioneer prophets. And, indeed, both figures are the incarnation of the struggles which the nation underwent in its slow advance from tribal henotheism and Canaanitish polytheism to a more refined and ethical Yahwism. Carmel and Sinai are both the local background and the foci of that contest.

No wonder, then, that the miracles told of one in some form or another are woven into the life of the other. In the biography of these two men we are confronted with the spontaneous production of the mythopoetic creative faculty of the nation. It is the people, inquiring into its own history and destiny, that presides at the loom on which the miraculous thread and web is spun. Not so in the gospels. Here the artificiality of the method is at once apparent. The purpose to constitute the Nazarene the greater Moses and Elijah is patent. Every miracle wrought by Amram's son is also performed by Mary's child, but always in a heightened degree.

Leaving to one side these secondary miracles or myths we shall find in the Old Testament representatives of every variety of myth that we have discovered in our study of non-Biblical folk-poetry or literature. Let us not be afraid of placing our Bible into this company where to be is its by right of similarity of origin and method of composition and compilation. The Bible is literature, the literature of a highly gifted people; literature covering a millenium reflecting the various moods of the national soul and preserving the successive stages of its sponsors' development and growth into the realization of their national dower and destiny. As such literature of an ancient people the Bible cannot be expected to be the text-book of geology or astronomy or to have anticipated the discoveries in our physical or physiological laboratories. It is not even a manual of history; for the ancient nations did not write history as we do. But as such literature it has a value which no other estimate of its character can confer upon it. The soul of its parent-people glows in every line thereof. From that soul was mined the gold of the passion for

righteousness which is the *Leitmotif* of its mature message to the world, a message which has aroused the zones to joyful echo and is today, as it was of old, the tonic chord in the faith of humanity's best and purest.

If this literature frames myths which as records of actual events we shall not accept, its value is thereby not impaired. Its very myths breathe the spirit which has enkindled with life its every note.

Of nature-myths we find but a limited number in this literature. The book of Job and one or the other psalm show traces of their currency among the Hebrews. But we have a goodly representation of what is denoted as culture-myths. The change from the civilization of the hunter to the superior conditions of the Nomad's pursuits is enclosed in the relation between Essau, the starving huntersman, and Jacob, the shepherd, who is well warded against hunger. The transformation of the shepherd into a farmer, successful only after repeated abortive efforts comes to light in the story of Abel's murder at the hands of Cain. Tribal qualities and antipathies have also informed many an incident. Is not Jacob the typical shrewd Semitic shepherd? And is not Abraham the incarnation of another and nobler type still now found in the black tents of the Bedouin? The migrations of the patriarchs are personified movements of clans. They are credited with erecting altars which enjoyed high repute among the people even in days when the stricter Yahwism of later development would question the legitimacy of these ancient shrines. Moab and Ammon, arch-enemies of the sons of Israel, are charged by tribal myth with incestuous origin. Now it is a name that no longer understood gives rise to a story; anon it is a verse of some ditty or rhyme

come down the ages that evokes the explanatory event. Samson's life teems with incidents of this kind.

A festival which has grown up naturally and has in its development from a pastoral feast into a day appealing through a changed ritual to an agricultural people, kept pace with the evolution of the nation's culture would be connected with an important and decisive crisis in the history of the clans. And spontaneously the mythopoetic faculty responds to the impulse. Advancing civilization does not blur the memory of the ruder habits and rites of former days, a strange custom or festal song has, perhaps, served to fix the former practice in the economy of certain localities. What may have been the provoking event? Jephta's daughter's fate illustrates in its composite character of the therewith associated story this class of myths. It would account for a rhyme and a festival dear to the maidens of the district and in so doing fossilizes the old rite of human sacrifice and even weaves into the many-threaded pattern of its tradition one of the wandering legends, the Hebrew counterpart to the Greek of Iphigenia. And is Samson not also of this order, the Hebrew Hercules, the sun-hero? Does not proverb and rhyme and name furnish the irritant for the free activity of the myth-weaving fancy in stories illustrative of the life and the labors of the forebears? Locality is also a fertile source. The bleak and desolate region of the Dead Sea challenges the harmonizing propensities of folk-fancy.

Every nation under God's sun has so accounted for desolate wastes. Let no one rock them recollections of great geological cataclysms. Vineta is the Baltic version of Sodom and Gomorrha. This fancy is free of the burden of complying with nature's rigid inflexi-

bility. When it was in its prime and therefore most productive, it looked upon nature as a congeries of personal volitions, unhampered by such laws as we have detected to hold stars and stones and rocks and rivers under impartial dominion. Animals speak, and why should they not? A generation but little removed from the influences of the Totem age could not feel the difficulties therein involved. The medicinal value of a brass serpent, the curative effect of representative gold mice and bubos are precipitates of the Totem age and the reflection of its convictions. Fairy tales also have deputies in this congress of myths. Elisha's bear devouring the mocking children is of one of these. That myth is often faithful to local coloring, as for instance in the description of the Egyptian plagues, need not astonish us. Poetry mixes its colors very frequently in accordance with the pattern which nature furnishes. He who wrote the epos of the Exodus or reduced it to written form was not ignorant of Egypt's circumstances. His *systematic* disquisition, however, bears the earmarks of having been worked out in the solitude of his study, his intention is clearly to controvert the theology of the Pharaoh's; he gives us neither history nor mythology, but theology.

But I must hasten to the conclusion. One word has to be said which often is neglected. Underneath this mythology of the Bible pulsates still another force. *The Midrashic method has inspirited the Bible.* Originally the spontaneous outpouring of unconcerned national reminiscences and ambitions, the literature of Israel passed at a later epoch through a reconstructive process. In this way its contents were enriched with the added significance of being witnesses to the universal reign of those principles of righteousness which con-

stitute the burden of Israel's message to the ages. Almost every life and every story was re-adjusted to the demands of this higher outlook. Israel had become at last the people of priests, the one nation reading its national duty in terms of service to the one God, a service which demanded obedience and love, not sacrifices. The Bible was heightened from literature into *the* book of religious instruction.

Every stage of the nation's growth into and toward the light had left its imprint upon the manner and matter of popular tradition. This final climax recast the material once more. And the later Midrash followed in the footsteps of the Biblical Midrash. How beautifully, for instance, is the story of Israel's wandering in the desert applied in the homilies of the rabbis. The story of the divine protection and guidance by a pillar of fire at night and a cloud by day, is undoubtedly the offspring of the method employed by the tramping tribes to beacon the direction to the long drawn column. Modern writers on the marching arrangements of the pilgrim lines on their way to Mecca have recalled the Biblical scene. The Mannah, too, has for its basis the occurrence of a resinous shrub in the peninsula and the burning bush of Moses holds for its nucleus of fact the existence of another shrub native to those regions. But both Bible and Midrash have done better than to dwell upon these germs and to point to them in proof of the veracity of their records. They have made the miracle the vehicle of moral instruction, a new and nobler poetry built on the old.

The prose of the camp-lights, or the moving cloud of dust, or of the secretions of a tree, or the fiery blossoms of a shrub or the roar of the volcano, ancient seat and center of tribal worship, has been transformed into the

peal of God's own voice, into lessons of divine guidance and human trust which are true forever. This truth we cherish. It needs no confirmation by miracles, it is its own recorded witness, its own prophet and revelation. The pages of the unfolding centuries are a scroll continuous, each line of which echoes the one thought of every miracle turned into a Midrash:—God reigneth, his dominion embraces all the worlds and is without end. This faith will not parent miracles. It had found its voice before Sinai was believed to have thundered and should Sinai cease to be awful as the theater of theophanies it would still ring on.

Myth or miracle for this confidence in the essential righteousness of the universe and the duty of man to strive after righteousness are *indifferent* alternatives. Before the forum of literature and scholarship miracle belongs to the realm of myth but religion, our religion spurns the crutches of a more limited assurance, it rejects the belief in miracles not because it would have less of God, no, because it has more of him. God's law is not in heaven, it is not beyond the sea, but in our mouth and our heart *to do it.*

The Place of the Individual in Organized Charity.

This house has often received distinction by the presence of men and women come together under the sacred impulse for earnest words and work. Rarely, however, has a gathering claimed the hospitality and inspiration of this Temple which we knew to have a stronger claim upon our recognition and sympathy than your conference. The fact that busy men and much engaged women will leave their desks or lay aside other duties and will pilgrim in these days of summer discomfort to a city not their own for the purpose of bringing and receiving counsel and exchanging experiences bearing on the improvement and enlargement of methods and means in philanthropic endeavors, is in itself an omen of good results and augurs well for the spirit dominant among those that guard the interests of Judaism and its professors in our beloved country. Like you, so have the members of Sinai Congregation no anxiety more pressing than through religion to learn how to vitalize theory into practice. The subjects which your papers discussed with such breadth of solicitude and depth of intelligence have at other times not been excluded from the privileges of this pulpit. Years ago, indeed, this congregation shared with many of her sisters, the prejudice that religion stood in no relation to

the efforts aiming at the amelioration of social conditions. Today there is no member, I dare say, who knows of Sinai's convictions but understands that the social perplexities troubling our generation are fundamentally religious problems. They vibrate with the appeals, the regrets and the remorses of an aroused social conscience and it was this conscience which the prophets of old stepped forth to awaken from lethargy and irresponsiveness fostered under an idolatry to false gods and ideals. Judaism certainly has among its sanctities none that may outvalue its insistence upon man's call to be his fellowman's keeper.

Nevertheless, though an humble teacher of this prophetic Judaism, I should never of my own free choice have presumed to address you, the officers and delegates of this conference, had your own generous invitation not conferred upon me the precious prerogative of craving an audience for my faltering words. Experts alone should demand a hearing in an assembly of this order. Certain it is none other is justified to pretend to the censor's and the critic's part. Perhaps the consideration that I have had the advantages of a modern theological schooling in which sociology is almost focal, has emboldened those who arranged your suggestive program to venture upon the always risky experiment of assigning me a place among the designated speakers. Conscious of the obligations which this confidence entails, I am encouraged to repress all timidity by the reflection that in this city, if nowhere else, congregations have been forced to lay aside the altogether too

common prejudice which will hold the rabbi, through the infection of his profession, to be always woefully lacking in common sense and always deficient in those capabilities which enable one to grasp propositions and convictions with a view to their practicability. If this prevalent misconception of rabbinical, congenital or acquired obliquity were supported by reality, no preacher's voice should be raised in a gathering asking for light on such grave matters as have been under discussion this day. For they are by no means theoretical subtilities. Beyond what academic attraction they own, they have an incisive connection with hard and stubborn practice. But then modern theology, too, has been impressed with the solemnities of the practical things. The poles at which its spark leaps out are not in the misty beyond, but in the impressive now and pushing here. Thus it has always been in Judaism. Our religion never recognized the divorcement of practice from theory, of the secular relations and responsibilities from the sacred Our theology has always been sociological in intent and practical in purpose. The modern theologian who has come to understand the true aspects of his profession and has earnestly striven to prepare himself for its responsibilities does therefore not *a priori* fall under the ban which excludes amateurs, be their intentions never so noble, from the field.

The day for amateurs is past. In all the varied human activities, the call is for experts. Life has become so intense in all of its departments and so dreadfully in earnest in all of its conflicts and conditions that only

one guided by expert knowledge and fortified by delicately tempered elasticity of experimental wisdom, may hope to be of use to himself and to others.

Expert knowledge is by its very nature restricted, departmental knowledge. Specialisation is therefore the characteristic bent and necessity of our age. Encyclopedic and ecumenical science is denied us even in the one branch of human activities to which we have wedded our destiny and pledged our duty. A few decades ago every good physician could with good conscience give advice on every ailment that presented its horrors or tortures to his well-disciplined eye. Now, one who would pretend to such universal information would forfeit the confidence of his patrons. The diploma may still name him Doctor of universal medical science, but in stern and sober reality only a few counties of a small province of medicine's wide domain are absolutely and scientifically familiar to his trained and expert mind. And the same is true in all other walks of life. Encyclopedic knowledge and ability are today only the property of high-school graduates and even they learn to modify their estimate a few weeks after the close of their school quadriennium. Business illustrates this phenomenon as strongly as ever do the liberal professions. Everything is departmentalized and specialized. On all sides we are confronted with division of labor carried to its furthest point and a corresponding restriction in freedom and breadth of scope. This in turn has led to a stronger organization of the vital forces, with a view to correcting the one-sidedness

incidental to specialisation and broadening again in the results the current of life dammed back and dyked in the initiatory flow and carrying force. Interdependence and association play a part in the economy of human life in a degree and intensity as never before. The whole world of commerce, industry and thought and aspiration is under its spell. Books of exceedingly great importance to scholar and investigator have ceased to be written by one or the other of earth's greatest. Those that today demand the hospitality of our libraries' shelves and admittance to the sanctum of the studious searcher and thinker, are the children of many parents co-operating, each bringing his own specialised science to the common altar. The department store with its possibilities of evil and its power for good has its counterpart in the co-operative expeditions and researches for which nations even are asked to stand sponsors.

Association in philanthropy, now the shibboleth under all skies, is under the same law and is expressive of the same prevalent tendency and recognized necessity. Division of effort, if uncorrected, leads to waste of energy and increase of ineffective outlay. Its antidote is offered in the comprehensive scheme of co-operation and association.

The evil of specialisation and the loss which is incidental to it, which is in fact the price which we pay for increased effectiveness in doing a very small thing but doing it profoundly well, have furnished pretext for many a highly impassioned protest. Becoming this or that, and then even this or that only partially, men

have shrunk from the whole which erst was their measure. Totality is denied specialised men. Under this denial their moral nature suffers. Into a part and fragment men cannot throw their whole soul. This is the burning indictment written by prophets and articulated by prophetic passion and impatience against our modern systems. They denounce them as man-destroyers. And they are in the right. This is the burden of Ruskin's bitter expostulation with our factory-enslaved and factory-made society. He laments, with facts to comment most pointedly his regrets, the death of the artist who in his supreme and sublime independent creative activities produced always a whole something, which as a whole could not but partake of the beauties of cosmic creation; his ire is stirred and his irony aroused by the sight of the slave doomed to monotonous tricks in the making of something of which he only sees a part and a part at that the relation of which to the ultimate whole he cannot anticipate by divination nor figure to himself by retrospective imagination.

Similarly, though with less justification, have voices in angry resentment been raised to denounce and expose the debasing effects of the new philanthropy. Organized charity, many have contended, is a misnomer. In its name the very flowers which awoke under the touch of the angels of sentiment and sympathy while men and women did, to use the colloquial phrase, "their own charity," are now plucked up by their roots. Cold and often cynic pedantry wears the crown which by rights belongs to warm hearted and tender compassion. What-

ever imperfection may have clung to the old method, it had redeeming virtues which in the new are utterly absent. Man met his brother man. The hand of the petitioner grasped that of the helper. Eye looked into eye and heart beat in response to heart. No screen of official formality separated the sufferer from him who had the power and the desire to ease it. No deputy whose real impulse is the greed for office or the need of a comfortable berth and the feathering of his own nest, acted as the go-between. If there were the difficulties and possibilities of error always besetting personal relations, there were also the rewards and incentives which never fail to tell through personal contact and personal interest. Gratitude is eliminated from the new equation and the joy of giving has been chilled by the subscription blank. The whole matter has been reduced to figures and columns of figures, speaking of classes and categories into which human folly and human suffering and human tears and human despair are pigeonholed. The modern scheme culminates in administration by proxy and therefore the very soul is taken out of benevolence, for proxy is incompatible with genuine sympathy and where this sweet perfume is rejected, cold mechanical routine soon completes the asphyxiation of the warmer and nobler impulses.

In these and similar counts runs the indictment. Were the charge well substantiated few there would be to stand up and defend the unmitigated fraud or say one word in extenuation of the shameless pretender to distinctions legitimately belonging to another dynasty.

We should all make haste to return to the better ways of olden days, when pity was deep and benevolence was directly responsive to the call of weakness and blindness. And none would have the more urgent duty to protest than he who from the prophet's watch-tower must proclaim the woe to them that name sweet sour and sour sweet and parade death in the garment of life. But is there no third possibility? Is the alternative rightly pointed between the slipshod but impulsive ways of former schemes and the systematic but frigid devices of the new school? Must we forfeit the personal factor and force and all that it implies when we would apply in the domain of philanthropy the principles operative in all other fields of activity, *viz.*, specialisation under the law of division of labor and assignment of function and its corrective and corelative, organization, strenuous and systematic and of wide reach?

A deeper analysis of the aims and expedients of organized charity as understood by expert science will reveal that contrary to this accusation, which declares organization to sound the death-knell of all vital and personal attributes and achievements in the household of altruism, the new system calls for more strenuous assertion and more insistent consideration of the personal equation than did the old. It opens opportunities for personal work and redemption which at its best the old never suspected. The new has indeed no patience with mere gush and sentimental spasms. But let us be candid; did not in most cases the much-lauded charity of the heart cloak underneath its wide folds the barest and

most disgusting selfishness? The motive underlying the ostentatious act was always anxiety to win respect and respectability. And in the other instances when this was not the prompting reason, the gift was expressive of a selfish solicitude to escape from one's own conscience. Charity was degraded into an expedient to bribe providential Nemesis into connivance. The doles and driblets falling into the dirty clutches of the beggar were expected to purchase for the donor a crown in heaven. Even in the still more restricted number of acts in which this speculative element was not dynamic, acts generally performed by hysterical or thoughtless women, it is plain to the psychologist that the impulsive and if you so will spontaneous benevolence of former days, even at its best and noblest, did not aim at the relief of the donee so much as at that of the donor. The benevolent would have the right to admire herself a noble woman. The well known charity fiend, a very pest and plague always, is of this order the most striking specimen. Her busy determination to help the poor is to her a source almost of carnal pleasure. She must have "*her* poor" to satisfy her own appetite for self-adulation. This sort of charity is like the craving which possesses the opium eater. Let us be glad that organized charity has limited the field of the charity fiend. Let us even so rejoice that it stands between the impulsively and sentimentally benevolent and their own defenseless self. This indulgence in the voluptuous sensations of helpfulness to others, like every other unhealthy pandering to excessive or illegitimate appetites,

must in the long run weaken the whole organism. Whatever the new scheme may have wrought in other regards, having reduced sentimentalism to a minimum and unmasked the egotism of the usurpers that would parade in the purple of queen charity, it has certainly been of mighty benefit to the classes whose privilege it is to give and in so far it has earned its title to grateful recognition on the part of all who would have us be stronger men and truer women.

Indeed they are strangers in the outer-courts, let alone in the holy of holies, of modern philanthropy's sanctuary who have not learned to know that according to the decalogue there enwalled, the collection of money is the least of its anxieties. Among its promises there is no laurel wreath for the rich man who gives only his money. Contributions in the coin of the realm is the smallest service and the easiest which is demanded. The collection of the funds required is of course an indispensable function. But money is after all in the conception of the new science of social hygiene, which is only another phrase for modern philanthropy, merely what the lubricating oil is to the engine. It cannot be spared, but he who handles the can must have a care not to get his fingers soiled. Nabob who subscribes readily or under pressure no matter how great a sum, but who will not give what is nobler and more essential provided he own it, *himself*, has not yet been touched by the new conviction of the better minded and more purely souled who, having no money or little to give, give *themselves* to their brother. Let hired panegy-

rist at the bier sing the praises of defunct mere millionaire in never so many keys if he be proclaimed a truly generous man, cassocked preacher or fashionable rabbi though the hawker of these common religio-social polite deviations from truth be, the truer estimate of the deceased money-maker's life's worth will be in the verdict that having no self to give to others he occupied only a very small place in the moral economy of the fraternity of man. Humanities cannot be expressed in terms of the bank account. And as the prime solicitude of philanthropy is for a nobler, truer humanity, money cannot be the primary or ultimate equivalent of its implications.

But how so does the modern philanthropy, organized as it is and must be, offer opportunity for the devotion and cultivation of this which is more vital than dollars? Few are the places on the administrative boards and executive committees. Are all others excluded from the blessings which the priestly ministry at the altar earns and dispenses? Indeed not. Regiments of thousands of workers the new philanthropy would enroll. Brigades of volunteers are needed to carry out to the full its program of social redemption. This army "whose duty it is to save" has rank and brevet for both the young and the old, the learned and the illiterate, the rich and the modestly-pursed. Organized charity reads through the eyes of the friendly visitor. It mobilizes the sympathy of the college settlement resident and sends out its sisterhoods of love. This is the Paradise of personal service which the new charity

recognizes. It is not true that because we have eaten of the tree of the new knowledge we have been expelled from this Eden and are now denied access to the old tree of life. The new charity is a cherub, welcoming all who ask for admission at the threshold of the home of peace. Its is not the flaming sword keeping at a distance the weary pilgrim. Its is the palm beckoning him to approach and enter. The friendly visitor, the resident and the sister will glean all the spiritual ecstacies and enjoy all the pleasures of personal contact which we have heard so often extolled as the compensations of the former personal system. But they will do this in saner measure than was possible of old. Their own manhood and womanhood will grow because their brother's or sister's whose friend they would be, grows also. They give while receiving blessings and the recipients of their confidences give as much to them as they bestow upon them. This reciprocity of increased humanity the old method could not actualise. Gratitude in the new is not one-sided. It leaps into flash at both poles of the circuit.

If, on the one hand, false inferences have been accentuated as to the ultimate impoverishment of the stores of sympathy and love which man up to this age of system idolatry and organizing monomania could readily replenish, on the other, with like want of judgment, false expectations have been raised and encouraged as the promise of the new methods. The ferment of the old leaven of egotism has not been neutralized entirely by the alkali of altruism believed to dominate the sons

of our generation or the sons of Israel's covenant. Many have hailed the new order of things in our charities and have lent it support and countenance because they anticipated to get immediate release from obligations which are essentially of a private nature. But organized charity never was meant to shield the strong and capable, the rich and affluent, or even those in modest comfort against duties which family and friendship or association in business or profession impose. These relations are elemental. They persist in spite of all concentration of effort and combination of resources. The brother primarily remains the ward of his brother. And the friend retains, first and last, his sacred claim and right to the help of his friend. Through the varied ramifications and within the extensive range of these interdependences and natural and moral affinities, even under the most exhaustive application of the schemes of organized charities, there will always be ample room for the assertion and activity of private interest and intense personal sympathy. It is also a mistake to suppose that organized charities are intended to cover the whole field of altruistic effort. The little mountain brooks continue their descent from the heights though their waters combine in the low-lands to flood the deeper current of the rivers. On their way to their destiny the silvery wavelets kiss into fragrance and call into flowered charms the rocky borders of their sloping bed. As we are members of human society our altruism merges with kindred impulse stirring our fellows, in a broad stream sweeping before the eyes of all on to

the waiting ocean. But while we are tending to this common goal many a thought and consideration consecrated to and centered in the welfare of one or the other individual must and may shape itself into deed of which no record is kept, save in the great ledger in which God himself makes the entries. The detection of genius or talent frittering its soul away in the drudgery of menial work when natal endowment cries out for the opportunity and freedom to prepare for the ministry of the arts or the priesthood of the sciences, is still incumbent upon individual magnanimity. Little reflection suffices to expose the groundlessness of the apprehension that under the new system there is no place for individual effort with its attending rewards and increment of moral force, as well as the utter baseness of the plea that organized charity shall relieve its contributors from obligations which blood and spirit have woven and continue to impress.

In our fetich-worship of institutionalism, however, we deprive ourselves of natural and abundantly proffered opportunity for individual sympathy and personal interest. This idolatry of institutionalism arises from the mistaken notion that the problems of philanthropy are exclusively economic. Were they this the conclusion would be inavoidable and incontrovertible that the economically cheapest plan is always the best and therefore under all circumstances the one to be adopted and pushed to its consistent end. Under the additional pressure of parsimoniously provided means and the constant prospect of a deficit, small is the

wonder that he who entertains the opinion that institutionalism is not sanctioned by the demands of better and broader science preaches to deaf ears and if he persists runs the risk of personal disfavor justly visited upon a pestiferous crank or worse. The paucity of resources is always a potent argument. Its well-nigh universal and painfully palpable presence may be admitted. But is there no possibility of sparing the minds of those who would look after the welfare of our dependent orphans and old people, the fright from this gaunt spectre and thus to predispose them into greater readiness to accord an audience to the advocate of a different scheme? I hold that there is. The collection of contributions is a department which should rigidly be divorced from the distributions of the funds or their application and expenditure. Because this principle has not been sufficiently well respected our efforts have more or less been hampered and the prime discrimination which the anxious stewards of our various benevolences were compelled to carry in mind was naturally the cheapness or expensiveness of the devices proposed. At last, we in Chicago as before us our friends in Cincinnati, have resolved to separate the two distinct social operations, the collection of funds from their appropriation. As the new division will prove its wisdom by the results, even now foreshadowed in the experience of our community, its friends will multiply and the revenues will augment.

Institutionalism with its prime recommendation of cheapness will in consequence lose its pre-eminence in

the exclusive favor of the well intending but naturally indolent public. Because institutionalism has been our sole refuge, it has not earned an unclouded title to continuance. It is now ramparted behind the natural inertia, the disinclination of groups of men and minds to make a change. It is dyked, as already indicated, by the figures of the financial secretary's reports. I, for one, cannot but feel a twinge of conscience that somehow or other I, as one of the men of the pulpit, have failed to do my full duty when listening to the congratulations loudly emphasized at our annual meetings because we have succeeded in reducing the annual cost per capita to one hundred and five dollars in the maintenance of our homes and asylums. I am willing to suppress my suspicion that these figures have been doctored by the failure to include the original investment in buildings and grounds and equipments, interest on which certainly is a charge legitimately to be booked in the balance sheet. My grief arises from deeper sources. In order to reduce the cost per capita we have had to increase the number of inmates. And increase of numbers herded together under one roof, to my understanding, is not a provocation to felicitation but a cause for serious alarm. And why? Because philanthropy is not a province of finance but of ethics. Did the moral life follow the line of least resistance there would be no further call for discussing the situation. Institutionalism is certainly the plan which offers the easiest and, we are assured though I doubt this, also the financially cheapest solution. But it is characteristic of the moral life never to flow

like water along the line of the least resistance. The contrary is the case. To be moral, thought and action must often take the line of the greatest resistance. Were man exclusively under the laws which regulate the motions of planets or the development of plants; were mind and mud in one and the same plane or soul and seed under one destiny doubtlessly the search for the least resistence would be prudent philosophy. But man is not exclusively organized matter. His is a moral law and a moral purpose. His humanity lays upon him the painful task to forego ease and meet difficulty that in the overcoming of the obstacle he may find his own moral health and happiness. Israel has never followed the line of the least resistance. Its philosophy is the accentuation of the contrary proposition from that which advises pursuit of paths of minimized effort. Let us under the noble consecration to do good to our fellowmen which is now upon us in a degree formerly not attained, remember that this philosophy of our religion must also enter into every branch of our work. We must wean ourselves of the fatal conceit that economic cheapness or moral easiness is the decisive factor and sole consideration. We are asked to reinstate the individual in his rights to personal sympathy and personal activity and interest. In restricting our institutions to the absolutely needful and maintaining them merely as sheltering houses for the limited time which must elapse before homes can be found for child or veteran, we shall open a way for the exercise and fruition of individual interest in a degree unattained by our immediate

predecessors. In saying this, far is from my mind the intention of framing one phrase which might be heavy with the bitterness of criticism of the spirit manifested in the government of our Jewish institutions. As institutions they challenge the admiration of the world. They have no superiors. And among our neighbors few are found to be on as high a level. Fortunately, we Jews have received from our past of suffering a legacy which proved an invulnerable armor and shield against many of the vicious tendencies operative in the institutional charities of the non-Jews. We are not very apt to brutalize and terrorize and demoralize the wards entrusted to our keeping, be they tender orphans or tired veterans.

But for how long will this legacy continue to stand us in similar good stead? Let us not deceive ourselves. Our grand temples, our large congregations with their wonderfully learned and mightily eloquent spiritual leaders have as yet not solved the insistent problem of how to re-activize in the generation born in the flush of our new day and under the insidious and distracting pressure of modern materialism, the stirringly sacred memories of a past of bitter suffering and ideal hopefulness.

We have not as yet been able to requicken the experience of the fathers into incentives for the sons. Some have perhaps fossilized custom and ceremony and deem the task done by cataloguing rites or exhibiting implement in the show-case of a museum. We would have these memories be momentous with force-

ful moral life, mentors and megaphones of calls to men and women of unborn tomorrow.

And when, as I am afraid will soon come to pass, that source of influence shall have ceased proffering its refreshing draughts, our institutions will fall as inevitably under the blight of institutionalism as have the others founded and reared and administered without the restrictive and remedial if subtle antidotes, come to us from our glorious memories of martyrdom. Will then the Jewish community awaken to the necessity of accommodating their philanthropies to the better scheme of individual treatment under organized direction and supervision?

Economically speaking, it may be true that no child could be reared in a private family at $105 per annum. But what of it? Physiology teaches us, and psychology presses home the lesson, that organs, if not employed, atrophize. In the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky the fish have no eyes. Having no need for eyes they never activized the optical nerve and the optical organ. Put a fish into this lightless lake today and let his offspring swim about in it for one or two generations, his descendants will gradually lose sight and will ultimately accommodate themselves to absolute darkness unlit by star or satellite.

If we, like those specimens of the finny tribe, will cease utilizing a function of our moral organism, it will die. Take away the child from his mother, the child is not the only one to suffer. The mother herself is doomed to greater privation. The mother's maternity

is weakened. Take away the venerable grandfather from the household, put him into a beautiful hotel, give him all the comforts that bountiful ingenuity can devise, his grand-children, losing his presence, will forfeit an incentive to activize an important function of their moral nature.

Morally measured, a plan which is under the besetting anxiety of regarding the family as focal, sacred and inviolable, is by all odds the better. With every child that comes to the household a new source of blessing opens. The child is the Moses, wielding a God-gifted staff to compel the rock to yield the refreshing and invigorating waters of love. Unhappy the mother that has lost her child. Unhappier still the woman that never has had a child.

Childlessness was in the Biblical perspective the very culmination of misery. It is the Psalmist's most significant promise that God will cause the childless woman to inhabit the house with as intense joy as is the mother's who clasps to her bosom her glad sons.

Were this view-point more earnestly emphasized, would the difficulty appall us? Could for almost every totally orphaned child not a childless woman be found that would be willing to enlarge her own soul by taking into her own home and her affections the fatherless and motherless? The alchemy of that child's love and presence will make her more of a woman and her husband more of a man. And the guardian appointed to keep a watchful eye over the child so placed will soon discover a new melody to his life. His ward will grow

into his heart making him the richer, while his care and confidence cannot but help enriching the soul of the orphan. These few suggestions indicate what wide scope the non-institutional scheme promises for individual effort and reward for rich or idle men and women, who now are frittering away their excess of ethical motives to no purpose, and would fain find satisfaction for their yearning to be of use personally to some one whom they could love.

But would not at the same time the children also be the gainers? There be those that are fanatics of uniforms. Alas! that our steeples should sound the death-knell of the 19th century, while brass buttons again are the coveted possession of every little ragamuffin of the street. Alas! that this 19th century should totter to its burial while uniforms are the affectation of every fashionable miss and every foolish matron, and khaki is the latest rage and fad.

At a time like this to speak against uniforms is blasphemy, and he who does this is held to be either a crank or an old fogy.

Is it not an inspiring sight when thousands of orphan children pass by in perfect alignement, every motion in rhythmic swing, every eye in one direction and every nose elevated at the commanded angle? Is it not stirring to hear their band play the martial marches to which the volunteer regiments went forth to battle and stormed the bastioned hills of our enemies? An inspiring sight! Ask the French writers what life in military barracks means? Read the books that have come hot with the

passion of vehement protest from the presses in the French capital last year, and then plead if you dare for the military system of education, which must unavoidably obtain in large institutions.

I know full well some of our orphan homes have not branded their innocent inmates with the brass button stigma of public support. But even so, does the child enjoy to the full what is the every child's by God's own law, his or her individuality? Is it possible to conduct a family of 97 children with due respect for the individual scope and initiative of every child? I deny the possibility. They must eat at the tap of the bell. They must pray at the call of the trumpet. They are in grave danger of being shriveled into automatons. They lose what no one has a right to rob them of, their personality, their personal distinctness and value. And having no outlet and provocation for their filial affection, this function of their moral nature goes to seed. It atrophizes.

Once in awhile a great man will arise,—and I know one such whose name to mention delicacy forbids,—who owns a wonderful genius for love, who knows how to awaken filial feelings in the hearts of his "little" (?) family of five hundred and more children.

But have you the assurance that his like will again be found? Blessed the institution which is under his guidance, but all the poorer by comparison are the other institutions that are not in the care of another like him. Men of genius are not made to order. They cannot be commanded by never so liberal a salary and never so

alluring an advertisement in our religious (!) papers. This matter of atrophizing filial affection is by no means of no moment Pedagogues know that when a child is of necessity deprived of the natural outflow of his filial sentiments, these will seek another channel. Repressed, they assume volcanic violence.

Hence, in large boarding-schools, hence in our institutions, certain peculiar – to use no stronger word—and disquieting mental phenomena are always sure to appear, which Kraft-Erbing and other alienists have not been slow to number among the anomalies, and moralists among the dreaded immoralities, to which the herding of parentless boys and girls is apt to lead. This anomaly is characterized by the exuberance of attachment for the neighbors in the dormitory, and this unnatural excess of affection for boy on the part of boy leads to—horrors! This danger is always to be apprehended when the child's natural right to love mother, father, or one that takes their place, is unnaturally denied him.

But, say you, it is difficult, yes impossible, to find fit foster fathers and mothers. It may be difficult, but I deny that it is impossible. Most of the inmates of our Jewish orphanages are halforphans, their mother being the survivor. In this case, the solution is extremely natural and easy. Aid the mother to rear her own child or children. Appoint a guardian to assist her in this arduous task. The guardian will become her friend. The money which she receives will go a great way to make her economically independent. If she lives in a

neighborhood which does not promise well for her or her children in morals, induce her to settle in other quarters. The child will grow up in blissful ignorance of the fact that he is a recipient of charity. He is not removed to a palatial "hotel" for a few years to return to his original and naturally more modest surroundings and feel that his mother's home is too mean for him. If a girl she grows up in the family and naturally learns her household duties without ado or trouble. There is no danger of contracting unnatural friendships. And the mother herself is protected against the temptation to forget her child and to contract a second and generally unhappy matrimonial responsibility.

But what about those that have no mother or are total orphans? Is there no aunt or relative that might be trusted and would gladly accept the trust under conditions like those outlined? And if there is not, and these cases will be so few as to become almost, as the French mathematicians say, a *quantité negligeable*, some decent childless family can with due effort be discovered where the child will under the supervision of a conscientious guardian enjoy the advantages of a homelife and win his way into the affections of his foster parents very rapidly.

And especially in small communities this family plan is feasible and very easy of execution. It will save many a child from loss of self, but seems to me it might also rescue the small country congregation from the curse now upon most of its class of utter selfishness.

The country Jew has become a by-word among us.

Mention of him leaves a certain by-taste in our mouth. What does the country Jew do for his Judaism? At Pesach he buys about ten pounds of Matzoth, and on Yom Kippur he locks his front door while the rear door is open. That is all he has of Judaism. His charities are zero. He belongs to a lodge. If there be an orphan in his town he sends him to the cities. He is entitled to this by virtue of his membership in the secret brotherhood. Now why should he not retain these poor orphans at home? Guardianship will give him a new interest in humanity. He will awaken to a new sense of responsibility. In the open country the child is certainly better off than in the crowded dormitory of the Asylum. And the mother will not swell by her removal to Cleveland or Chicago or New Orléans the population of the ghetto or slum. In the small congregation my plan offers no difficulties, provided we recognize that in moral things the line to take is not that of the least but often that of the greatest resistance.

Organization seems, in another way, to trench upon individual rights and duties. Under it, the temptation is always to classify. Statistics is the besetting thought and with a view to the annual report's showing, superintendents and others are very apt to run toward formalism and to believe that the main object of their employment is to register and catalogue. Certainly we must classify, and that not merely for the purpose of statistics, but also for the purpose of remedial activity.

But let us not forget that men never belong totally or

identically to a class. The old Talmud tells us that God created every man in his image and still he made no man the exact repetition of any other man. We are not exact counterparts one of the other. You who are engaged in the line of business, which even God was engaged in as a *Malbish Arumim*, know that ready made garments cut to average patterns never exactly fit the actual man. We have our indiosyncrasies and eccentricities. Some have these and others those. But each one is a pattern to himself, and no two living human beings are exact duplicates.

For all our classifications and classes, when dealing with the dependent, the poor and the sufferer, let us remember that we are not dealing with a set. We cannot pigeon-hole applicants. We must individualize them.

Superintendents are natural victims of their profession. Their professional disease is the gradual but unconscious loss from sheer over-use of the power of individualizing. Where is the remedy? Shall recourse be had to interference by the Boards? The Boards are auditing corporations of the finances and in their hands lie only the general policies of the society. Would a Board in a hospital presume to interfere with the doctor's treatment of a case? It is the doctor who has to decide whether a leg has to be amputated or not, and if the Board in charge of a hospital should presume on the score of the expense involved to stay the surgeon's hands, the members thereof would lay themselves open to the just criticism of an indignant and outraged public.

It is the physician's and the surgeon's exclusive part in clinic or ward to diagnose the case and to prescribe the treatment.

We are dealing in our relief work with sick persons, so to speak, with the maimed and the mutilated. They must be individualized. There is no single case of typhoid fever that runs a course identical with another. There is no single case of hunger, of dependency, of despondency, but has its individual aspects and its individual modifying and moulding causes. The Board cannot interfere. It would not interfere with the superintendents, if we had the superintendents that organized charity calls for.

Organized charity has created a new profession, a profession as high as is mine, as is that of the physician, of the engineer, and of the trained man of business. Applied sociology demands professional training, knowledge and judgment. Our universities have courses for those who would pursue this new vocation. We have independent degrees even in the departments and branches leading to the required preparation for such posts and charges as the superintendencies of our institutions and of our philanthropic agencies.

It is time to remember that we must have professional men in these responsible positions. Economically biased, of course the man of business will argue that the cheapest man is the best man. If the market is overstocked with worn-out rabbis and decrepit teachers the rate is very much depressed. Worn-out rabbis are cheap, and as not every rabbi is so placed as to be per-

fectly outspoken and still secure of his position, and on the contrary some always are, in the elegant phraseology of our congregational bosses, out of a job, because forsooth they have incurred the disfavor of Mrs. Newly Rich, or cannot compete in personal beauty with the Apollo-like graces of a younger rival, there is very little danger of the supply of "misfits" running short. Provided his terms be not exorbitantly high the old or discharged rabbi is elected to the honors and entrusted with the responsibilities of the superintendencies of our charities. This metamorphosis from awkward clerical helplessness to trusted competency and appointment is all the more remarkable since while the rabbi is still in the flush of his mental and moral vigor he is rated an ignoramus on all things bearing on charity. He is kept off the executive boards. His suggestions are sneered at and laughed at. Though he has never handled a shoemaker's awl or worn the cobbler's apron, he is told to stick to his last. Wisdom on the needs of public or private relief work is the sole prerogative of men and women who have come by their science by intuition and not by tuition.

I am not in this drawing a portrait of one or the other of our superintendents. I for one respect them most highly and would trust their judgment much more readily than I should that of their infallible superior officers. But because the knowledge has still to be spread abroad that positions like theirs are for professional experts with all the freedom that such professional science should be accorded, the work of even

experienced men is hampered, and ultimately robbed of its effectiveness. Professional training must flower, and does so, into sustained open-mindedness. Practical experience, unless corrected and deepened by professional science, cannot escape falling into errors indigenous to the atmosphere of irksome and irritatingly monotonous complaint and insolence of appeal which every day and in all seasons surrounds the desk and fills the office. Unless this natural condition be corrected by the resourcefulness and resiliancy which the professionally trained man should and does possess, the work will lapse into routine and generalisation. The applicants will cease to be regarded as individuals. They will become figures.

The expert, scientifically trained administrator will never ossify into a mere cataloguer, or a quack with a patent medicine believed to cure all diseases. As would the conscientious physician, as would the good lawyer, he will treat his clients not as members of a class but as individuals. When he has made his diagnosis and prescribed the treatment, no board has the right to say him nay. His professional knowledge is supreme.

As little as the board in a well organized congregation has the right to order what a minister shall preach or not, as little as the board of a charity hospital is authorized to regulate the surgeon's operation; even so little has the board of an organized charity to direct the professional work or verdict of its expert superintendent. Experts will agree that it is wiser to help one case effectively than to so manage and mangle one

hundred cases as to average an expenditure of $3.45 for every petitioner. Better one case helped at a cost of a thousand dollars than a hundred cases not helped at the same expense.

Professional men are not cheap. The professional men are dear. It is never the cheapest but often the dearest man that is the best man.

And another thing seems pressingly needful in our organized charity. We must guard the individuality of our applicants by building our offices in such a way that privacy can be possible for a man or woman who for the first time in his or her life treads the thorny road and lays his or her misery bare to another fellow-man not of his or her blood.

These are perhaps Utopian demands, but they are demands that have the approval of our religion. They are the flowers grown on the stalk of applied ethics, of modern sociology.

We Jews have a duty to perform to the world. We boast of our mission. That mission is not to shout into vacancy "One God, one God, one God." The old prophet protested: "Shout not היכל ה׳, the Temple, the Temple of God." Our mission is to be the leaders along the paths which they walk who know that our one God is the God of the rich and of the poor, the God of the white and of the black, the God of the Jew and the God of the non-Jew. To be the leaders along this path is our duty now if ever, for when was time, when opportunity for this duty was more insistent when was society cleft more painfully into classes and masses

than today? Moral distress stalks about in every camp. Men rely upon bayonets, not upon ballots; upon bullets and upon the policeman's baton, and not upon the power of reasoning. Selfishness rampant on all sides, brotherhood on none.

The cry of despair and of discontent fills the heavens in every zone and in every clime. Where autocracy is supreme and where democracy nominally is triumphant the same cry, the same rage, the same stupor and the same stupidity. This is the Jews' opportunity.

The Jew has always been in his philosophy a socialist. Our prophets were the first socialists. They preached the doctrine that the individual is only for society; that what we are or have belongs to all, though we are the stewards for all of our talents, time and means and minds.

Our old prophets craved for justice running as free as does water. They had words of stinging censure for those that lay on their beds of ivory and heard not the cry of those they had robbed and despoiled. They cared not for the festal offerings of those whose hands were red with the blood of persecution. But they yearned for the dawn of the day when God's love should fill the world, when every man should sit under his own vine and his fig-tree. This plea for justice was the sum of their belief in one God; this made them the prophets of God's own chosen people.

Our monotheism shall not signify moneytheism; it shall be turned into a humanitarian force. The world shall once more learn from us that it is possible to

bridge the chasm between the learned and the unlearned, between the wise and the foolish, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, that this harmonizing and socialization of interest and possession can be wrought without interference with individual ability and individual opportunity or responsibility. The world learning this by our example will indeed say: "This is a wise and noble people." Ah! Might we understand this! Might in every city a Jewish pattern society be found on the broadest basis, of the newest design, built on the pillars of the old Jewish love of man for man. Then we should contribute more, than by our temples and by our prayer-books, by our festal days and by our days of rest, to the hastening of the time when on the heights the Song of Peace will sound its sweet melodies and in the valleys its noble refrains will echo, of millions freed at last from fear of death, of millions brought at last into the light of God's love. And you men and women who have come to us with your zeal for the noblest things and thoughts, you are the vanguard of our Jewish army, whose motto is: "It is ours to save." We Jews constitute a salvation army, indeed! Not a salvation army with timbrel and drum, with blaring bugle, and blatant blasphemy, but a salvation army with the Bread of Life, with love of man for man, a salvation army stationed at its post by God in the dark past, an army only to be recalled from its duty at the supreme hour when the world indeed will be full of God's knowledge, and therefore of God's peace and love as the waters cover the deep sea;

when no one will presume to tell his brother, "Know thou thy God," for every one, the great and the small, the old and the young, the strong and the weak, will show by their lives that they are alive to the truth that each one holds what he has, talent, time, treasure, opportunity, means, in trust for his brother man, for humanity at large.

"Israel, to thy tents! Let thy light shine out upon the world." Teach the world by thy deeds that nobler than that *Agape* which in another book is said to be the greatest in the trinity of Faith, Hope and Love, is our *Tzedakah*, our *Gemiluth 'Hassadim*—justice and the interrelated consciousness of our solidarity as children of God's great family of man.

No. 15.

Some Tendencies of the Modern Drama

Discourse by Emil G. Hirsch.

RE-PRINTED FROM
THE REFORM ADVOCATE.
BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS.
CHICAGO.

"Some Tendencies of the Modern Drama."

Text: Second Chap. Hosea.

Books are the windows of the soul. Through them we can peep into the innermost being of their authors. But the authors themselves reflect a light which is not theirs. They too are linked to their day. Their speech, and in the sense not merely of the articulated sounds, but of the thought carried is echo of the dominant ideas and the ruling passions of their age. However great a man be he is bonded to his nation, to his generation. He is a mountain peak, courting company with the clouds indeed, catching the morning dawn's greeting first and retaining the evening dusk's beauty last; but for all that, he is upheld by the mountain range below and with it in turn roots in the lowlands.

This it is that stimulates interest in the study of literature's masterpieces. We are rewarded for our quest certainly by ascertaining how universal ideas become individualized as viewed in the love and the lore of a great thinker. Literature is revelation. It unfolds what its prophetic progenitors held to be vital truths; it shows what powers were magnetic in their life, what intentions were dynamic in their labors. Commonplace readers have no eyes perhaps for this gold that is treasured in the mine of every true book. They search amusement in it; they expect pleasant sensations, and in their appetite for the unworthy they are cheated out of true enjoyment.

Books may turn into action; words may take on per-

sonality. Not only once "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word became flesh and dwelt among men." Similar miracle, if miracle it be, incarnation of idea in life takes place daily. In fact, it is distinctive of the creative mind, to transform idea into personality, impulse into experiment, and conflict into vision.

The dramatist certainly holds this divine appointment. He bidding to his aid all the resources that nature has provided, the eye, the ear, the mind, pictures in the living to his auditors the workings of a theory of life which he believes or knows to be fundamental. The stage, therefore, is under consecration as profound as ever was temple or shrine. The church too has occasionally lapsed from her high duty; so the stage has fallen at times from the high plane assigned to it in the economy of human idealities. But on the whole it may be said, as of the church so of the stage, that fidelity has been its virtue. The masterworks of the great dramatists, they who still speak to us after the flood tides of passing centuries, have indeed proven their divine selection by the fact of their survival.

Aeschylus speaks today in tones as ringing as he did when Greece shouted her joy to him in gratitude for vocalizing what she felt to be vital. Shakespeare is immortal, because his is the dialect of the true humanities, and these are independent of locality and temporality. Goethe remains a prophet. His Faust will stir inquiry, will command emotion, will energize intentions until the crack of doom announces the end of all life and things on our shattered globe.

What be the vitalizing purposes of the modern stage? I would not survey the counterfeit, the caricature though perhaps it holds the central place in the attention of the general. I should profane this hour were

I to detail scenes magnetic merely through their obscenities. But the man of this day, who endeavors to pass through life with open eyes for the realities, who is not absorbed by the daily slave work that necessity or greed has placed upon his shoulders, must recognizing what the stage tokens and what its functions be, have a deep anxiety to learn and to understand the reason why the modern drama is busy with certain social perplexities and is attracted to the presentation of certain phenomena in modern life the world all over today.

Is it true that they who by genius kissed, have stood in the morning hour on the highest peak of vision, have caught the infection of the basest? Is it true that they who have the rare ken to read love into the stars and passion into the plants, have all of a sudden been seized with the fury to delve in mire and to deal with mud? Fanatics in the pulpit have so held, and others echoing opinions not of their own fashioning, have occasionally emphasized this erroneous view. No, the great modern playwrights in Italy, in Scandinavia, in Germany and even in England, nothwithstanding her Puritanical prudery and tradition, have turned to these darker problems not because they would pander to a morbid appetite for filth, but because, children of their day, they are consciously as their lesser cotemporaries are unconsciously, under the influence of a philosophy of life which seems to justify the disregard of old canons of conduct and to make light of the old solemnities of time-honored moral codes.

The obsession of our day has been for many circling decades to bridge the chasm between man and brute. This desire to link mind to mud came upon us in consequence of our greater familiarity with the things of

dust. We unrolled the curtain from off the sky as never generation before ours had dared or had succeeded. We deciphered the inscriptions of the rocks in a way which left no doubt on their ultimate meaning. But doing this work in detail and piecemeal we outraged the innate desire of the human soul for unity. Knowledge not unified is a flirt promising joys which she never bestows. Laugh as much as you may in your conceit of enlightenment, at the presumption of religion to build a system of thought coherent which shall embrace the visible as well as the invisible! Religion in doing this does not violate man's natural leanings, but conserves them. There are men that are not true, there are puppets that know not why they move; there are souls so dead that never they ask why and whence and whither. No true man, however, but feels the burning desire to have rounded out in fundamental harmony theory of life and explanation of the universe. This harmony religion establishes. It is not a presumption on the part of religion to know. The agnostic who resigns himself to ignorance outrages the human soul. Laugh as much as you may at the metaphysist's endeavor to cast light into obscurity and to link together in one system what the dust seems to token and what the divine has to tell! For a long time the scientists affected to scorn metaphysics, though none of them but found the credentials for his work in laboratory or on observatory by the constructions of metaphysics. There are some awfully learned young men, or old men—they are abundant, especially in Jewish circles,—who having sipped the light wine of science, affect to say that the realities are central, while theories are at the utmost in the periphery, but these have been left behind by the onward march of better information. They claim to be

in the van of progress, and as such they are admired: but in sober truth they bring up the rear. There is today no scientist but has acknowledged the legitimacy of metaphysics and its necessity for his own work. There is today no physicist but knows that when he speaks of force, of energy or life even, he is employing metaphysical concepts. There is today no astronomer but sees in the revolutions of the spheres and in the harmonies of the siderial systems more than methamatical or mechanical evolution. He knows that behind mathematics is mind, and thus confesses that teleology, or the theory of purpose in the universe, has found today again credence and standing in the palaces of the most devoted students of nature. Metaphysics, like religion, is merely the stammered response to man's inborn desire for harmony of knowledge, for unity of intention.

But natural science, having found mud and mind linked together has attempted to build up its own philosophy. It struck as its keynote the concept of struggle. The whole world is a battle field. On a large scale the contest is waged on the heights. Within small compass it is fought with as intense a ferocity even in the little globule of water. The tear that you shed is an ocean in which, so to speak, battle ships sail against battle ships, and discharge their rapid firing guns at one another. The whole world, whatever is, whatever lives, is under the law of conflict. This concept certainly admits of no quibble. It has found the key to the mystery, if *not of being,* then of becoming. Through conflict men conquer, through it humanity is lifted to higher position and richer potentialities.

But to this fundamentally true concept of the universality and the benevolence of conflict, the metaphysics

of the natural sciences has added another idea that in this conflict universally waged, naturally and necessarily the stronger alone survives. Searchers did not pause to define strength, and thus they jumped at the conclusion that physical strength or depth of cunning is the decisive force which wins the prize. Once under the spell of this unifying idea, they like the systems of former days, threw the light of their theory on what was obscure and pretended to hold together in one what seemed to be disparate and separate. They drew for moral life the inference that strength is a law unto itself; that the strong man, as to him belongs the victory, is under no obligation, that he is free to do as he lists, and not to do as he likes. The strong man is beyond the moral and the immoral; good and evil for him in the alembic of his strength are dissolved into fancies. The weak may perhaps be under law, but the strong is not.

This is the culminating assertion of Nietzsche. He is typical of our day. Philosophies are not born at haphazard; they do not leap out because a brain illuminated or obfuscated out of the depth of its own quick virility, or halting femininity fancies certain things to be and certain factors to obtain. Systems are built when they must. Philosophies come as projections of often subconscious and unconscious tendencies of the times in which they are cradled. In our day of Darwinian notions, when the struggle for existence is invoked as the ultimate, not merely for the formula explaining celestial quantities and qualities, but for the interaction of social forces and of industrial and economic purposes—when Pseudo-Darwinism is appealed to, to justify anti-Semitism, for instance, to place racialism on a high pedestal again—in our age so constituted in its intellectual affectations or dispositions, Nietzsche is the

natural and logical exponent of the practical and ideal interpretations of the meanings of life and of the mysteries of the universe. In an era when Bismarck, the Man of Iron, is in the focus of national idolatry, when the strenuous life—with guns that shoot—is the fetish to which nations bow the apostolic pronunciation of the canonical value of strength as the ultimate, had to come, not because Nietzsche happened to stumble upon it, but because he grasps, as genius always does, and concretes and crystalizes the notions prevalent and dominant in our generation. Nietzsche preaches that every strong man is a law unto himself, and that the strong man need not care for restrictions that traditions have sanctified; that the strong man certainly, as none can oppose him unless he be stronger than he, has the right to live himself out at whatever cost to others. Others may for the lack of strength still carry chains; the strong man, as far as his strength renders him competent, may cast away the fetters, and laugh to scorn priest that claims, or conscience that protests that restrictions are sacramental. His highest law is to live himself out.

In Nietzsche's preachment we have at once the solution of the riddle, whence the peculiar tendency of the modern drama to dwell on marital infelicities and infidelities; why D'Anunzio, Sudermann, Hauptmann and others too numerous to catalogue, dip their pens into ink to affirm and to canonize this theory of certain natures' divine right to disregard conventionalities and even consecrations. What Nietzsche calls the Uebermensch, the over-man, the man who is a law unto himself, is central in these modern plays,

It is noticeable, however, that woman is cloaked with the attributes of over-humanity. Knowing the pecul-

iarities of our age, no one will be at a loss to discern the reason why as a rule woman is placed before the public in this role. It is not because modern writers share the old prejudice that woman is the mother of all evil. They scorn to teach that the part assigned to the Uebermensch is evil. They do not share the French cynicism which advises wherever crime is perpetrated the detective to look for the woman in the case. "Cherchez la femme!" is not the polar quest that guides their course. But they are exponential of the strongest drifts of recent decades.

Who has tugged at chains so strenuously so insistently in these days as has woman? Speak of the endeavors of labor to rise to freedom; the struggle on the part of the wage earner is perhaps more dramatic because it operates with greater battallions; but the heat of battle cannot be measured by the numbers of the combatants. Many a fight is bitter though raging between only two. A duel may be a very Gettysburg. Woman has been pre-eminently the struggler for emancipation in the nineteenth century. She has urged that her humanity was denied her. And with that peculiar fatality that seems to defy rhythm in the evolution of ideas, a fatality that the student of history has met on every page in the story of the intellectnal progress of the race, from the "underhuman" which women protest has been their assigned and enforced lot, they have reached out for the "over-human." In keeping with this phenomenon, the master dramatists of the day as a rule make woman the representative oracle of the overhuman. It is woman by preference that in the modern plays leaps over the barriers of conventionalities "dignified in the dialect of the unprogressive as moralities."

That Northern master in the art of character drawing

Ibsen, himself, one is tempted to say, an arctic sun shining above the horizon for one long summer day and setting in twilightless winter darkness for an equally long spell, was the first perhaps among modern playwrights of distinction to predicate of woman the "overhuman." His Nora of the Doll's House at least prophecies in this strain.

To theater goers as well as to the readers of Ibsen's works this wife who discovers that she no longer loves the husband with whom she is united, is a familiar figure. The saner among us I dare say have however never shed tears over her fate. We have not sympathized with her impatience at the trivialities of her domestic duties. We simply admired the great actresses that were able to lend some semblance of reality to this woman disillusioned by the discovery that her life had been a blank after her awakening to the fact that what her nature entitled her to, had not come to her share. Her husband failed to understand her. He has not comprehension for the greatness of her sacrifice. Domesticity crushes her. She knows herself destined for a fuller life. In her arithmetics of what she has wrought her child is ignored. She leaves her husband with the specious plea that the child will be looked after by the nurse. This misunderstood cramped Nora gasping for breath, yearning for freedom from irksome chains is the first in a long succession of "Uebermenschen" of the female sex who will on the stage not bow to the law sanctifying and sanctioning the conventionalities or the superstitions or the prejudices of a darker age and a more stupid and slavish generation.

It does not matter that Ibsen told of Nora's irksome struggles and disappointment at a time when Nietzsche's sun had not yet risen to the zenith. The affinity of

intention between the Scandinavian and the Teuton Titans is plain. Vain have been all attempts to invest with tragic pathos the fate of the woman running away from what had been to her a mere doll's house. Even the slamming door at the end announcing that she has gone forth to her freedom fails to make her resolution heroic. In her determination to abandon child and husband passion has not part. This circumstance has been explained as due to the Northern temperament of her intellectual father. But to whatever cause this peculiarity must be attributed the absence of this element makes her step all the more difficult to understand and to justify. Is it at all reasonable that a woman should leave her child to the care of strangers merely because at a crucial moment she finds herself disappointed in the man whom she took for better or for worse to have and to hold for her husband? To her child a normally constituted woman would have clung. In fact the thought of the child would have reconciled her to duties which while hard were by no means incompatible with self respect. The more closely the character of Nora is inspected the more clearly apparent does it become that Ibsen did not draw from life. He clothed a theory and a gospel of his own with the semblance of a woman. His creation lacks warm blood and healthy nerves. She is one of the thousand victims of hysteria afflicted with a false conception of what individual dignity and freedom imply. Had duty not been a complete stranger to her vocabulary none of the foolish misconceptions upon which her decision turns would have arisen in her mind. As it is she speaks the dialect of a philosophy that never appeals to a woman sound in body and sane in mind. Ibsen has failed to formulate the correct answer to the prob-

lem which he pretends to analyze. The conflict which he lodges in the soul of Nora is artificial. It is void of seriousness. It displays the well known marks of invention for stage purposes. The psychology upon which it assumably rests is false. Neither pathos nor passion is involved therein. We have in wearisome language an academic dissertation on abstract rights in which responsibility and maternal instinct alike are forgotten or wilfully overlooked.

Deeper understanding for psychological forces which often compel the rupture of bonds hallowed by morality is shown by the productions of recent German and Italian dramatists. If the intention of these be to preach the doctrine that "overmen" have the natural right to live themselves out they at least concede that the "overhuman" which brings on the catastrophe is not rooted in chilly reasoning but is under the hot breath of passion obscuring the clearer calmer vision of reflective mind. In this regard the palm belongs without doubt to D'Anunzio. His heroes are not puppets. They are moulded of flesh and blood. Their overheated heart it is which calls for freedom. But they do not reason out their right to live their own life as they list without regard for obligations previously incurred as one would a mathematical proposition. Passion defies logic. And therefore D'Anunzio with good tact refuses to syllogize. His characters we are able to understand and even to pity though it is plain enough wherein their weakness consists. Even passion is meant to be held in leash. Though this too must be said that often he who has fallen before the temptation is fundamentally a better man than many of the straightlaced automata of conventional correctness that know not the fury of the tempter. This may be distrust-

ed as a dangerous doctrine. But a deeper insight into the depths of the human soul will corroborate the main contention. Paul Heyse's Mary of Magdala gospels the theory. The fanaties of virtue often lack love. The scarlet woman often bosoms a heart which will flower anew as soon as the sunshine of a sublime faith melts the hard rind of sensuality. They who would cast the first stone are not always without guilt. Their souls may be dead or never have been touched to life. They are irresponsive to the invitations of a love which in its sublimity seems a revelation of the divine while she whose body has been tainted by lust and sin may be open to the call. Mary of Magdala is therefore not overhuman. She is transcendingly human. D'Anunzio's La Gioconda, however, varies the familiar theme of the fatality or freedom if you so choose to put it, of Titanic souls. The sculptor falls violently in love with his model. It is not carnal lust that makes him forget the vows he exchanged with his wife. No, his model has awakened in him the creative flame. As she sits before him his eyes see what for many struggling years he has tried in vain to behold and his hands force the marble to obedience in a degree before unattained. He feels that from this young woman before him has entered into his being something which gives his imagination wings. His artistic temperament outruns his conscience. He falls to awaken to the bitter reality of his undoing when it is too late to retrace the fatal steps. But it is the girl that will not relinquish him. If he will not be hers alive he shall be hers dead. She attempts to slay him. He is saved merely by the unselfish devotion of the wife whom he has wronged. But his soul has flown from him nevertheless. What the girl in a later interview

with the wife puts into vehement words is true. She it was that touched to genius his dormant powers. Therefrom she draws her title to possess him. Hers is the right of ownership in him and his work, the wonderful statue to which she was the inspiration. Obligations others than these based upon her natural rights she will not respect or even acknowledge. She will destroy the statue. It is hers as is he who created it. The poor wife again tries to save her husband's masterpiece. The knife that would have multilated the marble strikes her. The fiend cuts off her hands. It is in this wise that the philosophy of the natural rights based upon power presents itself through the prism of an Italian mind.

In Germany among the more famous exponents of the dogma stands first Sudermann. In his recent play "Es lebe das Leben" in English version entitled "The joy of living" he endeavors to justify the creed. He introduces us to the life of the higher classes in modern Berlin. Political trappings and discussions on the morality of dueling are among the "properties" he brings on the stage. Central to his intention is the character of his heroine, the wife of one of the aristocrats that make their bow to the auditorium to give semblance of vitality to his plot. Married when very young and like so many of her class without being touched by what the French call "la grande passion" the early years of her conjugal life were peaceful and uneventful and her soul found satisfaction in the unfolding sweetness of her child's nature. But one day there crosses her path one whom to see was for her to know that he was the complement to her own deeper self that she belonged to him by the prior right of her soul's needs so far not aroused and not appeased by the side of her husband. That

meeting gives her what she never knew before, true happiness and the sense of her due. What to her the marriage vows? What to her her obligation as a mother? She knows her rights. She has to "live herself out." The inevitable, to speak in the jargon of the school, happens. But her predestined complement, the man through whom she has discovered her true affinity and in whom she has found her so long denied fullness of life happens to meet her husband and become his friend. This friendship disturbs finally his equanimity. He feels squirms of conscience. Platonic friendship takes the place of passionate love. Years pass by. Political conjunctures make it advisable that her former lover should stand for a seat in the Reichstag formerly held by her husband. She knows what store her friend sets by political success. He will become a power in the state, the defender of virtue and the people's morals. She puts all her energies into the political campaign to achieve for him the ambitious victory. But this very political activity of his and hers is their undoing. Some former secretary of his knows of the past illicit relations between her and her friend. The catastrophe ensues. Her husband is estopped from avenging his outraged honor by an appeal to the code of the pistol. She confesses all to him but without the least tinge of remorse. What in sober truth was her crime? She merely followed the imperious impulse of her nature. This to do was her natural right. But she is generous enough to make way with herself but again not because the furies of conscience drive her to self-dstruction. No, simply out of consideration for her friend who gifted as few men are must live to do service in Parliament.

Dramas often terminate in death scenes. Poetic justice seems to demand this unknotting of the involved

plot. Or in the tragedies of profounder appeal the old Greek ida of black "Ate," inexorable Fate, is worked out to its logical conclusion and the pathos of the conflict is thus heightened by the fruitlessness of the struggle in which predestination on the one hand and man's desire, remorse or hatred on the other, are arrayed in unequal combat. But in this latest work of Sudermann's neither poetic justice nor inexorable fate insists on the final suicide. The woman's "overhumanity" alone justifies her suicide, as it does her attitude and conduct throughout. She is superior to life and the obligations it entails. Life is for her either the opportunity to live as she desires or it is an empty husk which at her own pleasure she may throw away. It is Nietzsche without even a figleaf that preaches the sermon from the first act to the last.

But shall Nietzsche with his autocratic and aristocratic moral anarchism pass for the final accent in the revelations of histrionic art? That he holds forth "from the boards that signify the world" as the Germans have denominated the stage, is a powerful commentary on the preoccupation of our generation. But the day of better things cannot be far distant. We may take courage. The signs are not wanting that the intoxication of misapplied Darwinian formulae is giving way to soberer valuations of the distinctions between the truly human and the really brutal. Many a soul is crying out in the darkness for a clearer light. In all fields of human endeavor the seers are on their watchtower looking out for the brighter morning. The brutal doctrine of force is rejected even by statesmen. Kipling's "Recessional" sings with truer note than his "white man's burden." While "overmen" still decree the course of commerce and industry, others are not silent

that call for remarrying power to responsibility. Conscience with its one and ever insistent sacrament "Duty" has not been finally silenced. And so after the obsession of this Nietzsche cult will have passed off, the stage also will again thunder forth the nobler truths that life is even for the strongest responsibility that freedom to do as one lists is of all forms of slavery the worst and most degrading. The new woman is not she that like Nora abandons child and home because forsooth she has linked her life to that of one that fails to do her justice. She will not slam the door upon her child's future for the sake of forcing her own liberation. No home in which a true womanly woman is queen is a doll's house. Even its trivialities are through the alchemy of duty lifted into tremendous potencies. No woman will reason as does the model in Gioconda. Or if she does her scarlet robes will not be regarded as the ermine of heroic virtue. No woman will without remorse avow such a misstep as Sudermann assumes one of noble birth will commit simply to fill her life with joy and then without shame glory in her conduct and finally to disembarrass not those that she has wronged but him whom she claims for her own and whom she has grudgingly given up while her soul is still aflame with unquenched thirst, with cynic frivolity end her life. The strong will recognize again that strength is not a patent to license but an obligation to be more loyal to the law evolved indeed by man in the course of the ages but bearing the seal of divinity all the more impressively because it carries the vital truths tried and found pure gold in the hot furnace of human pain and human temptation in the crucible of human shame and human remorse. Our religion certainly views strength and power in a light altogether different from that in which

naturalism and Nietzsche have construed their import and their privileges. Judaism's one solicitude is to make men human, not to allow a few to overreach themselves under the instigation of their conceit of being overhuman. This cry for fuller and freer life, this plea that strong natures must and may live out their life as their will dictates and their passion requires, of course, is in answer to the false insistence of the Church that nature is corrupt and the natural man is under the curse of sin. Nietzsche is the reaction upon the morality which Judaism never formulated in which weakness as such is canonized and stupidity or poverty of spirit is synonymed with saintliness. Our religion has always in its normal moods been opposed to whatever smacked of asceticism. Joy was its undernote and it quivered in every chord of its melodious intonation. But the joy of living which our religion offered to its devotees was that which flowered from duty well performed, from obligation seriously recognized. It tempered the hot breath of passion. It refined the lower desires. It harnessd the merely physical to the purposes of the spiritual. It proclaimed the Law in which good and evil were not eliminated or placed in a plane beyond which the strong had proceeded. No, evil and good, truth and falsehood were alternatives which man could elect and through the choice thus made, strength became either a blessing or a curse to its possessor. The Jewish woman was never weak in the sense in which the exponents of this modern doctrine of animalism would have us believe all women are that continue to be chained. Such freedom as Ibsen's Nora craved, as D'Anunzio's model insisted on, as Sudermann's Countess claimed, Jewish women have always spurned. Their freedom was the liberty of doing their duty. True has been

for all times what the Rabbis predicate of the evil years of Israel's Egyptian slavery. Jewish women wrought the liberation of their people. The modern drama mirrors our day's aberrations. Let us Jews have a care lest they picture also our conditions. As long as Jewish ideals of morality shall continue to be sceptered in our homes and find loyal exponents in our Synagogues a better, freer and nobler life will be ours than that which the new playwrights affect to hold up as true and legitimate.

"ATTACKS ON JEWS AND JUDAISM."

Lesson: Chap. iii., Book of Esther

It is not the fault of the Jew that the old oriental tale incorporated in the literature of the ancient Hebrews, about Esther and Mordecai, retains its pathetic interest. Thirty years ago there were those among us who honestly and openly were of the opinion that the day was not far distant when Israel would learn to forget the story of his persecution. But the assurance then treasured has been rudely dispelled. As in dark medieval days, so in these light flooded years of a new century, the cry is heard on all sides echoing the complaint and accusation of the old Persian vizier, that the Jew is a stranger in the lands where he has been given hospitality; that he pursues aims and ambitions distinctly and viciously his own, employing methods that are hostile to the welfare of the people in the midst of whom he dwells. The new age seems to have discovered many a new truth, but alas! not enough of truth to correct the old misconceptions to which the Jew has been exposed and of which he has been the victim ever since he made his first bow on the stage of time. No new indictment has been drawn; no new count has been added to the old bill. In whatever modern language the charge is phrased it carries the old burden, it reiterates the familiar accusation. In view of this constancy of prejudice, it behooves the Jew every year anew on those days when fiction or

memory speaks to him of persecution baffled and of hatred thwarted, to probe to the roots these wearisome and worrying misconceptions, to analyze the reasons of this universal misjudgment; to examine into his own conduct; to verify his own attitude. If there be in his own character that which calls for amendment it is his duty to set about remedying the defect. But if, upon investigation calm and dispassionate, the conclusion is forced upon him that his is not the blame, that what the world calls his stubbornness is really his fidelity in the service of higher ideals, the memory which speaks to him of conflicts erst won will be an incitement for him all the more to strengthen the foundations of his faith, to draw from the lessons of the past new vigor and virility for the contest wrathfully raging in the present. To this purpose I would have you dedicate with me the ensuing hour.

The old yet ever new accusations against the Jew may be grouped under four distinct heads. Each caption indicates an impelling error, which suggests in the minds of such as host the prejudice, the workings through the Jew of forces inimical to the best interests and the holiest intensities of the higher humanities. Time will not permit me to deal with all four; but the two that more than the others are in the forefront of attention I ask permission to present. The first source of prejudice against the Jew is a quasi scientific theory of racial distinctions. That the Jew constitutes a distinct race is the certainty cherished by his enemies. Less emphasis used to be laid on the distinctness of the racial qualities of the Jew in former days. That this element of prejudice has become very prominent in these later times is clearly the concomitant of the new philosophy claiming to be based upon natural sciences,

which has cast an unholy spell over historians and statesmen. Far be it from me to discredit the great achievements wrought by the young sciences busy with the secrets of the heavens and earth. If the latter half of the nineteenth century is aureoled in glory, the lustre came as a reward of assiduous court paid by master minds to the coy genius of nature. Our marvelous perfection in technical control over the resources of soil and sea, is clearly the outcome of our deeper intimacy with the world-building energies sweeping through eternity. But in the wake of this victory over reluctant Nature, has arisen a philosophy which robs man of the regal crown. Under the passion for unity which is characteristic of the bent of mind anxious to uncurtain the arcana of nature, the thought leapt out in fatal fury that mud was equal to mind, and man of one destiny as were the microbes. Men gloated over and gloried in the kinship thus established between the human and the animal. And out of this mood sprang the vitality of the idea that race is a determinant of the humanities. In the flush tide of joy at having discovered a principle to establish the relative ranking of the various and varied components of the human family, the prophets of the race Shibboleth overlooked that in strict scientific parliance race was vague and indefinite. This very lack of precision made the Fetish all the more popular. Historians and politicians proclaimed the new divinity and invoked it to lend dignity to their analysis of the moving impulses underlying the achievements of past time as well as the ambitions still aflame to reconstruct the map of the world. Materialism had contended that thought depended upon cerebral chemistry. Character now was declared to be the precipitate of blood qualities.

To the undoing of the true bond of humanity this notion of racial distinctions was called to the witness stand. Recrudescence of hatred fanned into a consuming flame withering tenderer flowers of sentiment and drying up the springs of sympathy marked the spread of the fateful creed. Blood decides quality, blood assigns rank in the human family. So ran its destructive insistence. Small wonder that the emphasis so beautifully put in the opening chapters of Genesis, on the unity of the race, was speedily blurred. Racial lines mark men as belonging to different groups. This uncertain note of the great anthropologists smaller men twisted into the assertion that these vague distinctions settled the question of the relative superiority or inferiority of the sons of man. Soon the Aryan was heard declaiming that his blood marked him the predestined leader of all mankind. To this conceit of the predestined superiority of the Aryan the re-rise of distrust against the Jew must be traced. The Jew of course may not boast of Aryan blood. The theory declares him to be a Semite. What matter that this thesis is open to serious doubt? Has passion ever weighed reason or evidence? But let for argument's sake the position be conceded. Is the further conclusion justified that because of different blood the Jew is the inferior of his Aryan co-tenant of earth? Stronger proof were needed than the hypothesis offers to substantiate the insistence. Still this Aryan conceit found willing acceptance and violent expression especially in Germany. In that land, once the glorious home of Kant and Lessing, to-day anthropology is cited into court to justify treason to all that Kant held holy and Lessing proclaimed. Formerly and elsewhere anthropology was content to register differences

in color, stature, and physiognomy observed among men. Or anthropology collected information concerning the habitat, the mental conceits, the religious notions of the various components of the human race. But to-day from being a descriptive science, anthropology is forced to assume the role of a normative regulator. The latest book on anthropology to make a stir, is entitled "Political Anthropology." To race qualifications are traced by this new branch of the science of anthropology capability for self government and predisposition for slavery. If in certain sections of the world political initiative is found to be active this political anthropologist ascribes this to the racial constitution of the inhabitants. Where on the other hand, this power of political self-determination is found absent, distinction of race is pressed into service to explain the difference. Formerly, you remember, climate, topography, the configuration of the land, the proximity of the sea, the height of mountains, the depression of valleys used to figure in the equation of political capacity or its reverse. But this theory advanced by Buckle and others has now entirely been crowded to the rear; no longer are the mountains invoked; nor are the meads brought forward; no longer is influence credited to stars, or to storms, to seas or to rivers. Blood alone is given the right to account for distinctions of mind, of morality, of political sagacity or political incompetence. Only the Aryan race, these new anthropologists tell us, is capacitated by blood for the progressive work of subjugating nature. All other races are fated to passivity. And among these that lack the initiative genius, the Semite again by his blood is gifted to draw profit unearned from the hard labor, the inventive ingenuity of the Aryan race. From this ingenious theory

the conclusion is drawn that the Aryans are by God, or by nature, appointed the rulers, while the Semites are marked in the laboratory of nature herself as dangerous to progress, a dissolving element against which precautions must be taken.

From the contiguity and contact of unequal races perils arise for the race of superior quality. Admixture of baser blood is to be apprehended. For the effect of such intermingling always has been the deteriorating of the quality of the original superior race. To prevent this uncanny eventuality must therefore be the concern of wise statescraft. Miscegenation will prove the deathblow to original inventiveness and capacity only vested in the pure stock. The Semite being of inferior blood his presence among the Aryan peoples is a grave menace. Hence, prudence would suggest that the Semite must be removed; and where this is impossible, that he must be placed under such restrictions as will under the play and sweep of natural causes tend to make his extermination an assured fact a few centuries hence.

This has been the program of political reactionary parties in Germany for many a century. Now it struts forth in the plumage of a scientific theory. It has met with willing acceptance by men of the Plehve type, the modern Haman's of Russia. Yea, a few years ago the jargon of this quasi scientific conviction found the French people in a receptive mood; if then to our consternation even France was on the point of forgetting her glorious traditions and memories, the sad phenomenon is sufficiently accounted for by the havoc wrought directly and otherwise by this pseudo-scientific doctrine which makes race the determinant of human values

In the face of this prejudice it is easy to see how futile the means are employed by some cowardly Jews to escape being touched by its breath. Mind you, it is race that determines superiority and inferiority. One cannot correct his race. Baptism will not wash away the stain of the inferior blood; change of name will not modify the quality of the life elixir. Political creed is ineffective as well. Blood is the decisive element, and it is constant. Even intermarriage will not help the matter, for according to this anthropology, the superior race is impotent to lift the inferior to its heights. Wherever the inferior race is allowed to intermingle with its better, the nature of the superior component is affected for the worse. Mix white and black, the result is not a better white, a nobler black, but a despicable Mulatto, who exhibits, so they say, all the evil qualities of his progenitors, to the elimination even of the possible factors of strength originally within the grasp of the inferior partner to this unholy union. Allow Aryan and Semite to mix; the Aryan loses and the Semite cannot gain. Hence it is essential that the modern Aryan be on his guard against the insidious attacks planned and plotted by the Semites, who would open wide the doors to the undoing of the Aryans by choosing wives or husbands from the nobler stock.

This consistent Aryan brutalism is without equivocation avowed by a large portion of modern German and European anti-Semites. They have maintained it in parliament, and emphasized it from public platforms, that the baptized Jew is still a Jew; they have proclaimed it in parliament, and have importuned the public authorities to act upon their protest, that the descendant of a mixed marriage one of whose parents is a Semite and the other an Aryan, shall not be cred-

ited with Aryan distinction, but be rated and ranked with the inferior Semites. It must be admitted that the logic of this demand cannot be disputed as soon as the chief premise is conceded. The theory itself has, especially during the last four years, gained many adherents, largely because a very fascinating book, written seemingly in a purely scientific spirit, has unsettled opinions and weakened doubts. I refer to the famous—or shall I say, infamous?—work by Houston Stewart Chamberlain, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century." In it Chamberlain operates with a free hand with the concepts of modern anthropology. While convinced that certain Aryans are predestined for excellence, he would qualify materially the scope of the general thesis. For this universal Aryanism would include many races or nations that, according to his Teutonic chauvinism, should be denied the glory of the foreordination. He modifies, therefore, the Aryanism of this modern school of anthropologists by introducing a new terminology and a new principle of selection. His predestined group he denominates the Germanic-Celtic race. To it he ascribes every act of which history has recorded the beneficial influence, making for advancement, for liberty, for civilization. This Germanic-Celtic aggregate he rates as the one factor and force in every movement upward, in science, religion, culture, commerce, industry and what not. He would have his "chosen people" be on their guards against the Semite, who will, unless checked, vitiate the blood, and thus will bring to an inglorious end the rise of mankind conditioned on preserving in absolute purity this stock of energetic men of toil, of inventors, pioneers, of men who have changed the surface of the earth and snatched, Prometheus like, from the stars the vital

spark of life and thought. Houston Stewart Chamberlain would not have had so many readers, and would have not found such ready credence had not the erratic genius on the throne of Germany found in the words and contentions of this Englishman writing in German a note quivering in harmony with a predisposition of his own. The German emperor made the curious book popular. Purchasing a number of copies, he presented them, with his autograph dedication, to his cronies. I am surprised that a certain American set has not yet made the book their newest fetish; for no American has been admitted into the august presence of the German emperor during the last few years, but was presented with a copy. I am prepared to hear that our Women's Clubs will have classes, to study Houston Stewart Chamberlain's book. Perhaps they are waiting till an English translation appears; but as the book is very bulky it is not likely that an English publishing house will venture on the enterprise. Still the moment it is translated into English we may make ready for its echoes from both orthodox and liberal pulpits. The likelihood is strong that then here by a certain ilk it will be dinned into our ears that the Germanic-Celtic forces have carried the whole burden of humanity while the Semitic hordes have been the parasites fattening on the labors of their nobler Germanic-Celtic producers. Ignoble envy, base passion are the inspiration of the modern as they were of the old Haman's. But being veiled behind a cloud of hazy would-be scientific notions, the motive of the modern is less plain than was that of the older; and his method is all the more dangerous.

In this situation, what becomes our duty? Those of you who have been regularly among my hearers

will anticipate my answer. I must again expose myself to being charged with repeating myself. But I am not Shakespeare. Nor am I rich. Shakespeare, I know, never repeats, and rich merchants, I must believe, are always original. That, at least, I learned from a play I recently attended while in New York. The central personage on the stage is a multimillionaire whose only argument is, "I am rich." On the score of his wealth, he presumes to be competent to do anything, and to be exalted above all the conventionalities and limitations that bind common clay. Upon the theory of this play I presume that one who is rich is never under the necessity of repeating himself. The wealthy are always original. But as I am neither rich nor Shakespeare, I must occasionally repeat; and to-day I shall repeat a very familiar contention of mine: In the face of this new racial conceit we Jews must have a double care not to fall into the error of our enemies. There has been Semitism as obnoxious as ever was Aryanism. This Semitism has found voice in Synogogue, and in Jewish circles at times in a pitch that goes far to explain and to excuse the extravagances of counter Aryanism. The Jew has been invoked time in and time out, in season and out of season, as the most wonderful type of humanity; and that not on the ground that he was gifted with mentality, or had been disciplined to keener morality; not because his history marked him a hero—these lines if at all were urged so faintly as to become imperceptible in the picture. But with all the greater stress was the "pure blood" of the Jew brought forward. Whatever distinction was credited or claimed revolved around the purity of the race to which all other excellencies were held secondary, if not regarded as consequences thereof. Hence the appeal ever iterated and

urgent to guard at all hazard this precious unequaled purity of the stock. Hence the cry against inter-marriage. Hence on the part of men and women who habitually sneer at Synagogue, and professedly are beyond the highest outlooks of Israel's religion, the strongest opposition to any step that might tend in the direction of rendering the purity of this exceptional blood less intense than their racial conceit imagines it is. As long as the Jew prates about his blood, as long as the Jew refers to his race, to the neglect of the spiritual elements involved in Jewish birth, he cannot be surprised that the larger world takes up the challenge and answers his boast with a still more emphatic declaration that Semitic blood is not of as fine a composition and preordained to as effective a potency as is that throbbing in the blue veins of a true and uncontaminated Aryan.

Racial chauvinism is the foam cresting the wave of modern naturalism. Grant that man is only a brute, then the quality of his blood determines his rank. This inevitably leads to conflicting claims. Pot would not be quite as black as Kettle, while Kettle would pass for a nobler aristocrat than Pot. Houston Stewart Chamberlain in sober truth is giving Semitic Chauvinists a Roland for their Oliver. Semitic presumption necessarily arouses Aryan pretentions. In the presence of this rampant racialism, modesty befits the Jew. A truce in the midst of Jewry to all high flown declamations about the Jewish blood!

But if this racialism is the main source whence prejudice flows forth a turbulent and turbid tide; if it is the arsenal where to-day hatred finds stacked its pointed and poisoned spears; the older jargon of distrust has not been forgotten and often its

venomous vocabulary may be heard in high and low places. Nationalism is the name of this older sister of modern racialism. The Jew constitutes a distinct nation. This has been the cry throughout the circling ages. It is still the fond conviction of the Drumont's, the Stoecker's of modern days, as it was the artfully worded plea of their prototype, the Haman of our story. In the verse that we read the grand vizier requests the king to give him power over the Jews, on the ground that they constitute a people scattered throughout the vast provinces of the realm, whom the monarch might well exterminate without risk of loss to himself as they refuse to recognize the royal authority living apart from his other subjects and obeying laws of their own.

Now, it cannot be doubted that at one time the Jews were a nation. But their political nationality came to an end when the state and temple fell. Certainly when Bar Kokba's rise against Hadrian was quenched in a torrent of martyr blood. I am within the bounds of truth when I say that with the crushing of this last rebellion against Rome and fate, Jewish political nationality changed from being an actual fact into a potential hope, sustaining perhaps the people in the dispersion by a ray of light recalling departed glory in the vision of future restoration. And this vision took on all the intenser glow because the nations would not admit into their nationality the scattered members of the extinct Jewish political nationality. In liberal pulpits, the story is popular which puts the blame on the Jew that the process of assimilation has been retarded, as it was he that refused to plunge into the mightier current of national life flooding and flowing round about him. This view is a wanton perversion

of the actual facts. The Jews long before their state had tumbled had made the honest effort in certain sections of the world to sink their political nationality into the mightier stream of the national life by which they were surrounded. Greek Judaism had arisen even when the temple was still standing. The Jews in Alexandria had become so thoroughly Greek that for them Hebrew idioms and the concepts expressed by them had almost lost intelligibility. They were Greeks in custom, Greeks in sympathy, Greeks in ambition. The only line of cleavage between them and their Greek neighbors was religion. If in the medieval days the Jews did not follow this example, theirs is not to blame. Medieval society pretended to rest on the pillars of the Christian church. This position of necessity barred out the non-Christian. The Jew had to be excluded; he had to be crowded back; he was forced to become an empire within the empire, a society within society. The Ghetto arose with all that implies; but it was not the Jew who primarily enclosed it with impassable walls.

Perhaps one modification must be made. There was an element in Jewish thought that made for meeting half way this intention of medieval society. Talmudism erected its bulwarks; the Talmudic scheme fortified the ramparts. It drew the line between the Jew and the non-Jew effectively. But this Talmudism, upon closer inspection, will reveal itself largely influenced by the tendencies without Judaism. It was devised for defense, rather than for defiance. It preserved because the world plotted to destroy Judaism. The distinction must be kept in mind between disappearance and assimilation. To destroy the Jew and silence his spiritual message was indeed the ambition of the medieval church and state. This conspiracy the Jew had to resist and thwart, for

the sake of the spiritual protest which it was his to point; and Talmudism served this purpose, though incidentally it culminated in a rigid system of segregation assumed by the Jew. Exclusion was necessary if Judaism was to be preserved in the conditions then prevailing. But when the nineteenth century dawned the Jew himself hastened to lay low the walls; it was the Jew, in Germany, in France, in England, that insisted upon being recognized as one of this modern political nation. The modern nations after the French and American revolutions emancipated themselves from the thought that credal religion was their fundamental support. The modern nations are not Christian in the technical sense of the world; therefore, they do not by sheer logic exclude the non-Christian, be he Jew, Mohammedan, Buddist, Agnostic, or atheist. The moment the world had weaned itself of the medieval conceit the Jew made ready to step out of his segregation. He was certain that political Jewish nationalism was an anachronism. Under this conviction, he demanded his rights as a citizen of the new states. The outcome of this agitation was the gradual emancipation, as it is called, of the Jews in modern Europe. The recognition of the right of the Jew to citizenship, with all that it implies, was from the very first regarded as axiomatic in our own dearly beloved America.

Modern nationalism, however, has been at work to undo what Riesser and his yokemates achieved. The nationalism of the medieval days was religious in texture. The new nationalism is not religious, it is racial. Its cry is; France for the French; Germany for the Germans; America for the Americans But who is French? Who German? Who American? In France, in Germany, they reason that race and nation are ex-

changeable terms. Therefore the German nationalists in theory identify German with and limit its scope to Teuton, though if the test were applied to the German people of to-day, very few would be found to square with the restrictive definition. Though Treitzschke and others have done their best to spread the erroneous theory, the German nation is not Teutonic. The Teutonic by no means is numerically the preponderating element. Still the theory served to cloak in patriotic guise the desire to expel the Jew. Here was semblance of justification for the insistence that a Jew cannot be a German; a Jew cannot be a true Frenchman.

What in the presence of this prejudice against the Jew, a prejudice based upon modern nationalism, is the duty of the Jew? I for my part do not scruple to declare it to be our all the more sacred obligation to reject the specious theory. Jewish nationalism adopts the fundamental contention and is therefore, a dangerous indulgence to be guarded against.

The saddest feature is that the Jew has himself caught the infection. The Jew has himself been led astray by the glittering generalities of nationalism; and we have been blessed by a renaissance of Jewish nationalism, vulgarly known as Zionism. If that movement were merely a concerted attempt to ease the fate and lot of the Russian, Roumanian, or Galician Jews, none of us could object. But it spurns to be philanthropic. It pretends to stand for the consummation of the Jewish destiny. It is based upon the assumption that the Jew to be Jew must belong to the Jewish nation. So great has been the fatal influence of this doctrine that men who thirty years ago were in the lead of those that insisted upon the de-nationalization of Judaism, to-day have become enthusiastic, fanatical adher-

ents and advocates of Zionism even in America. The only excuse for this is the desperate disillusioning that has come upon humanity, and upon the Jew; the universal despair of ideals. This Jewish nationalism is the acknowledgment that all our hopes and all our visions of a humanity based upon other elements than force, are chimerical. The Jew must not fall into the error of the nationalistic anti-Semite. We can understand the motives of a young German Jew if he heeds the call of the Zionists, for in Germany, contrary to law and to constitution, he is after all only a German by tolerance, a German deprived of certain privileges, while every obligation is laid on him. He is not permitted to become a commissioned officer of the army whether in the active service or in the reserve ranks. The judiciary career is but rarely open to him; if he prepares himself for an academic profession he finds the possibilities few, no matter what his excellence might be. Everywhere he rushes up against a dead wall, on the stones of which he finds written: "A Jew is only a German conditionally; not a full German." And yet these young Jewish Germans crave the full measure of national life. They are burning with the fever of patriotism which demands satisfaction and is refused opportunity. As Germany seems to deny them the full and free scope it is but natural though it is sad that they turn to the East, and under the spell of a vision grand and noble, believe that there lies the national destiny of the Jew, and there the field for patriotic culture. But here in America we have even not this dim shadow of an excuse. There is no call for Zionism in America, except that Zionism which is under the consecration of philanthropy, and would help the millions of Jews in Russia to a better future, to a

nobler opportunity to lead a decent life. Political Zionism is absolutely insufferable in America. Have we not a nation? We have one. Let those that deny this weigh their words. They ought to be ashamed of their argument, that even in America the Jew is only a second class citizen. What of it if we have social arrogance to meet? What of it if our sons are not eligible for the secret college fraternities? What of it if some snobs pretending to greater culture would look down upon us as not worthy of associating with them? I am conceited enough to believe that he who holds me unworthy of association with him is not worthy of association with me. Where I am excluded, the distinction of the exclusion is mine. It is the coward that whines; it is the fool that complains. What of it? Think of it! If Jesus, their Savior, as they call him, were to visit them, he would have to be excluded from their hotels and clubs, for he was a Jew. If St. Paul was to reappear on earth, St. Paul, whose words their pulpits reiterate as the foundation of their creed, he could not register in a hotel that does not cater to Hebrew patronage. The best men would be excluded, and the purest women, better men and purer women than are among the would-be nobility of anti-Semitic conceits.

The fact is the Jew in America has a nation. And in saying this I do not refer to the fact that once in a while a professional Hebrew is put on a polyglot political ticket, that one of my race, "a Hebrew statesman," or one of my religion is nominated for some office or other. In saying that we Jews in America have no excuse for Zionism, I do not even refer to the fact that in our Senate Jews have sat; as even now one whose father was a member of my first congregation in Baltimore has been elected Senator of

the great State of Maryland, a man who while religiously no longer in association with the Jews, has never tried to evade the circumstance that he is to all intents and purposes a Jew, one who has never allowed any one to throw slurs upon the character of the Jew without challenging him to substantiate the charge by evidence that could not be disputed. Even if we had not a single Senator of Hebrew birth, if we had not a single representative in Congress of Jewish origin, even if we had not a single constable, or something of that sort in this city or elsewhere to our credit, if at election time none would approach us and say, "Run for office," and if you run you get the Jewish vote and my support," if none of the party managers would believe, and they should not believe it, the story of the artful deceiver who tells them to nominate this or that "Hebrew" because the nomination will fetch the "Jewish vote;" if none of the party managers ever advertised in our Jewish papers so-called, my own included, still I should say the Jew in America has no right to pretend that he has no nationality. We have a nationality, it is the American. Let us be careful not to blur this truth. We are often careless in speech. We sometimes speak of Americans as though we were not Americans. How often have I been told "Doctor, we were proud of you to-day. You had many Americans in the audience." As a rule, I have only Americans in my audience. You are Americans. I am an American. Let us wean ourselves of this loose, slipshod expression which admits what is untrue, and what the Jew should not admit in this country. Mordecai in the novel is a patriotic Jew. He saves the king's life; he renders the state a great service. Confronted by the prejudice invoked by racial nationalism, it is the Jew's highest

duty to emphasize that as a Jew he has no distinct Jewish nationality.

Let us then carry home the consciousness and into our very ambition the conviction that in the presence of Aryan racialism, which is brutalism gone to seed, the Jews must have a care not to fall a prey to semitic arrogance. In the face of brutalizing non-Jewish nationalism the Jew of America, at least, need not fear. His nation is none other than that over which waves—may God grant that it wave forever—the Star Spangled Banner of Liberty, Justice and Law. Modern Hamans have made the story of Esther vital again. Esther may never have lived. I have no doubt, and I do not hesitate to say so, that the Book belongs to fiction. It is a novel, but like many a novel it puts truth much more strongly than ever reality could express it. A real Haman, who lived once and died then, what he to us? A real Esther, that was once Queen and then died, what she to us? A real Mordecai, that once sat at the Queen's gate, that once refused to bow to Haman, and once brought upon all the Jews the recoil of his stubborn refusal to show common courtesy; a real Mordecai who once became the successor of the dethroned favorite of the King, what he to us? The Book of Esther is so deeply pathetic and so eternally interesting because it speaks of tendencies and illustrates motives which never localized here and there, alas, have been universal, and are modern to-day. But the hour has grown late. I must leave for another occasion the analysis of the two other counts in the bill of indictment drawn by our enemies. That our morality is inferior and our religion the parent of our inferior morality, is among their claims. This accusation is as baseless as are the other charges.

I had hoped when a young man that the day would come when in a Reform Congregation the Purim feast might be ignored. But that day has alas, not yet dawned. Yet is the world full of the venom of Haman; yet is the world full of weak men of the stamp and character of Ahasuerus; yet is the world in need of the services of Esther, and of Mordecai. And because that need is pressing, the story and the feast have place even in the scheme of this radical Jewish Reform Congregation. Might Purim bring to you joy, but also the deeper appeal to meditate and ponder, to reflect and to resolve. Prejudice cannot be fought with prejudice, but it can be met by courage; it can be defeated by love. When they hate, let us love; when they misjudge, let us be careful to judge truthfully. When they invoke brutal convictions, let our souls be under the consecration of a higher and nobler faith. Amen.

No. 18.

The Concordance of Judaism and Americanism

AN ADDRESS

By

EMIL G. HIRSCH

THE REFORM ADVOCATE
BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS
204 DEARBORN STREET, - - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CONCORDANCE OF JUDAISM AND AMERICANISM.

AN ADDRESS PREACHED AT THE MEMORIAL CELEBRATION IN SINAI TEMPLE, SUNDAY, NOV. 26, 1905.

BY EMIL G. HIRSCH.

Where the Canadian Pacific, that mighty miracle of modern man's daring and doing, winds its ever narrowing embrace of steel arms around the giant frame and then the snow-hooded brow of the mountain sentries mounting the guard over the Rockies' midcontinental bastion, the wondering traveler wheeled along this imperial highway's upward coil in dramatic suddenness is brought face to face with one of the most striking exhibitions of Nature's curious capriciousness. However much he may have been impressed with the defiant boldness that reckoned not the menace of the roaring canyons over which bridge and span are thrown in proud unconcern, or with the stupendous assumption of security that holds in contempt the perils of precipices along which the roadbed skirts with tenacious grit; when at the great divide he notices how the chance interval of a hair's breadth between the peak's wrinkles determines the direction of the water-rills and the leaping cascades, he is stirred to reflection as by no other observation. Twin children

of the clouds, cradled in one nursery, the raindrops are here bidden separate. One rushes on to his destiny, meeting in his descent the morning's sun, the other hastens to his goal in the van of the evening's approach. Spun on the same loom, one silvery ribbon unwinds its broadening folds until they are tangled in the Atlantic's mightier nettings; the other unbobbins its stretching lengths to festoon the slopes inclining toward the Pacific. Though he know the law which compels one of heaven's tears to seek its grave in the birth-chamber of the daystar and the other to hasten to its funeral in advance of the sinking sun, at the impressive recognition of the phenomenon in the concrete, the observant witness is involuntarily oppressed by the consciousness that similar "accidents" determine the direction of men's gropings and enforce divergency of paths leading to different and widely-separated destinies.

But this depressing obsession soon yields to the inspiring certainty that only in the seeming whim and chance preside over the alotting of our fortune. Closer attention to the intention which underlies Nature's dividing decree soon will reveal that underneath the superficial divergence is operative concordance of duty. Both waterdrops that at the line must part from each other are commissioned to one and the same task. It is theirs to coax forth flowers, to fertilize field and forest. Both are messengers and ministers of life. And again when they shall have reached their respective goals, be it the sea which laps the Eastern shores or that which sings the lullaby to the Western states, the miracle of the resurrection which awaits them will wing both alike to new upward flight and on the heights their divided destinies will finally converge. Seemingly doomed to eternal separation, snowflakes and dewdrops that part

company at the divide are foreordained to identity of obligation.

Thus when closer analysis unfolds this ethical purpose which, cloaked or clear, is always fundamental in the Universe and which is never dissipated even when the factoring process seems to reduce the all to incoherent fragments, caprice of division is at once lifted to the potency of planned appointment. Accident under this view takes on the consecration of vocation. Differences are blotted out in the recognition that they are means to an end, and in the prevision of this end divergence of paths sinks out of sight while identity of responsibility which neutralizes all variance of direction looms up large. Name the watersheds which force division and divergence upon men what you will, race, religion, nationality, at the great divide the space which separates is infinitesimal. These channels through which humanity runs on to its goal are means to a common end. On all them that along these divergent paths apparently tend apart in contrary directions, one common burden is imposed. Theirs is the equality of function under the variety and difference of equipment. Like the river systems draining into different oceans, the various and differently endowed components of humanity are appointed to fill earth with life, ever enriching and deepening and broadening. This conception reconciles diversity with unity. It sees in the polychrome spectrum only unfolding white light.

Little dower of imagination, I hold, is competent to apply the pathos and poetry of the watershed's influence upon the direction of the raindrop's ambition, to the symphonic theme of this memorial day's chorus. At first hearing, its jubilant notes seem to carry the invitation to remember differences. It is the landing of

JEWS that it commemorates. It seems to emphasize those distinctions that set off the Jew from his neighbor. Or again if stress be laid on the country's name whose hospitality these earliest immigrants of Jewish origin claimed, the intention of our synagogal celebration may be misunderstood as planned to throw on the screen the peculiarities of American Israel, enlarged out of all proportion and thus invigorate the American Jew's insistence upon being accorded a distinct position of his own in the common household of Israel.

But give this day's jubilee-overture a second hearing! If it be true—and it is—that man is microcosmic reproduction of the Universe's macrocosmos, then it is equally beyond all doubt that in the plan of God nations and peoples are called to be microcosmic illustrations of the plan of the macrocosmic humanity. To the American nation was assigned task and opportunity to exemplify essential unity notwithstanding the influence of the various watersheds at which the lines of descent diverge. Almost all the races of the planet have made this land their trysting ground. Hither they have brought the best and strongest which it was theirs to develop. Religion in this country re-enacts the Pentacostal outpouring; the flaming tongues that token of the spirit speak their message in varied tones and widely differing dialects. Social customs, the ripples from many distant sources, give color and mobility to home and exclusive circles. Even in the press and on the platform, in our streets and villages the confusion of languages is documented. This exceeding abundance of variety constitutes one of the secrets of this nation's nervous vitality. Apparent discordance results under the consecration of patriotism in effective harmony. True, this morning's festal reveille stirs to glad reflection only a little more than

one of the eighty millions of God's children that call America mother or spouse. Yet, it is not in conflict with, nay, it is in confirmation of America's distinctive genius that the commemorative occasion addresses its call to one alone of its many components and contributors. *E pluribus unum* formulates a truth, radiantly visible in the vision of this day. By rejoicing as Jews we are accentuating our Americanism.

And in similar manner the pride of our Americanism which possesses our heart and is yearning for expression today, is not a protest against, it is a proclamation of our fidelity to our Judaism. Like America, Judaism has been appointed to pattern the richer diversities of polychrome human life. Its aspects are many; its vocalizations numerous. Catholic Israel wears neither the uniform of military barracks nor the livery of the penitentiary. Its is Joseph's coat of many colors. This continent has augmented the prophecies and proclamations of Judaism by another variation. This new articulation again is not rigid. It is vital and therefore flexible. In this its elasticity and vitality American Judaism only conforms to the historic plasticity of Pan-Judaism and carries it out to fuller productivity. It looks like an accident that we were directed at the watershed Americanward while millions of brothers were sent into Russia. To our lot fell American citizenship, to theirs slave service in the house of bondage more oppressive than ever was Mizraim. But that "accident" signifies duty. In emphasizing now our Americanism we vow to be true all the more devotedly to the obligation that our Judaism imposes.

In fact, he is ignorant of the implications of Americanism and Judaism both who would hold that between them towers a mountain range decreeing and enforcing

their divergent separation. The contrast not to say conflict between them, I know, is commonly summarized in the statement that America names the civilization of hopeful prospect, Judaism that of regretful retrospect. The latter is a tearful memory, the former a joyful anticipation. Tradition is Judaism's store; outlook America's strength. No more arrogant misconception was ever coined than this artfully pointed antithesis. Judaism is, if anything, the *one* religion of impatient prospect and ecstatic prevision of the unborn to-morrow. America has its traditions as clearly determinative as are the influences of the past that anchor Judaism to its historic moorings. The traditions of America reach back further than the discovery of the continent. Our jurisprudence is grounded on the old common law of England. And in these precolonial traditions which have been among the most prolific stimuli of American thought, conduct and character, Judaism has had a dominant part. In the "May-flower" *our* Bible crossed the Atlantic. At Plymouth Rock in sober reality the Pentateuch was recognized as one of the inspirations of the young commonwealth. The Puritans were, indeed, more Hebraic than were the Jews who landed thirty-six years later. Narrow were they, but their narrowness was ransomed by their strength. Serious were they, but their seriousness dowered them with the fortitude without which none may hope to yoke untamed nature to his purposes. Puritan Hebrewism alone enabled the pilgrims to exercise dominion over the wilds of their new home. This puritan spirit was nursed at the breast of Jewish literature. It was the gift laid by old Judaism into the cradle of this new civilization. It had share in preparing the advent of the era of independence, as in the thinking of the

men that later phrased our political documents undoubtedly Old Testament principles had had determinating influence.

One who can pierce through verbal husk to inner kernel can harbor no doubt on the essential concordance of Americanism and Judaism. The stronger the Jew in us, the more loyal the American in us will grow to be. What is the fundamental announcement of Judaism? You say the "unity of God." This may and may not name the characteristic element. What if the One God were conceived of as a dark frowning despot? There have been those among our enemies to misconstrue in this wise the meaning of our monotheism. They have said that the Jew in declaring his God to be One proclaims the rulership of an autocrat whose caprice alone tempered by bribes is the final arbiter of the world's and the human race's fate. This monotheism, they proceed to explain, is therefore differentiated from polytheism only in its numerial notation. I adduce this misrepresentation for the purpose of demonstrating the advisability of qualifying our definition. Ethical is the attribute usually introduced to distinguish the monotheism of Judaism. But what does the phrase signify? A German thinker of fame tells us that all religion is anthropology. In the doctrine concerning man flowers into view the true content of our consciousness of God's all pervading, all sustaining presence. One God is the highest expression of our conviction that as every man is created in the image of God every man by his birthright is the equal of every other man. Every man as partaking of divinity has a value which is independent of all the accidents due to the action of the watersheds. Man having a value inherent in his

humanity has personality and therefore has no price. Things may be purchased, persons cannot. The value of man is inexpressible in terms of the market. Men are not like the products of mine or mill equivalented in coin. Low or lofty every man incarnates something inalienable which is not affected by circumstance. In this something roots his free sovereignty.

Is not America's political creed the practical execution and activization of these fundamental conceptions of Judaism? Judaism's philosophy spreads the basis whereon rests the political practice of America. No other justification is there for the assumption that men are born free and equal than the conception of man as the incarnation of the divine, his personality constituting his unpurchasable worth and being the exponent of the One in whose image all alike are created.

This inalienable freedom of man is the freedom to live out the law of his being. Law and freedom are not contraries; they are complementaries. Judaism the religion of freedom was of necessity also that of the Law. To whatever degree the Talmudic system through micrology may have mechanicalized the Law, none who understands the character of Judaism but must insist that liberty to activize the freedom which it posits as inherent in man's participation in divinity, postulates submission to the supreme law of moral majesty and final supremacy. The law of the moral order is imperfectly expressed in the self-given law of state and society. Law is liberty potentialized, liberty is law actualized. The American's passion for liberty vouchsafed by law and for law grounded in liberty is foreshadowed and sanctified in the teachings of Judaism.

But the congruence of Judaism and Americanism extends further. Judaism postulates co-operation and co-ordination, as the principle of organized society. In the chapter all the richer in truth because it echoes old mythology, which records the creation of man, the duty and destiny of this last of God's creative acts is defined as rulership over all the preceding works of God. "They," in the plural shall have dominion, is the phraseology of the account. In other words *one* man is incompetent to fulfill this appointment. *No* man may be spared in the realization of this aim. Through co-operation and co-ordination of effort and purpose in ever larger scope the divinely decreed destiny will be attained. Our political method is co-operative and establishes the co-ordination of the various organs. Our national constitution is often described as a noble compromise. It had to be this as exponential of the principles under which alone freedom and law can be made effective, viz., co-operation and co-ordination, But not only that written charter, the very life of the nation's plan of self-government is imbued with these principles and informed by them. Home autonomy and national authority are the two poles. America begins with the free individual, leads him for co-operation with other free individuals, his equals, along ascending steps to come to the town-meeting which then expands into the municipality and county, these autonomous corporations growing into the state and the states finally constituting the Union. Above the Union the unwritten yet wonderfully effective Highest Law, the law not only of this nation but of all nations, the Law which is the outflow of the Moral Order of the Universe, the moral meaning of all humanity's strivings

and struggles. If the Jewish Commonwealth was a Theocracy, our government is also in the true sense of the term theocratic. The implications of the belief in the One God are basic to our democracy.

Often antagonism is predicated of Judaism as of religion in general to the buoyant energetic spirit of America, its assertive self-conscious self-reliant realism. How far this suspicion is justified in the case of other religions, it is not for me to verify. Against Judaism the imputation cannot be maintained. I know that in some synagogues the conceit has been encouraged which would make of Judaism another scheme of salvation, a preparation for and an assurance of immortality. Under this misapprehension, indeed, Judaism would have little sympathy with the realities of this world; nor would it have any but an indistinct message for this life. But is other-worldliness the dominant in Judaism's proclamation or the inspiration of its prophecy? Clearly not. Judaism would inform this life, this world. It would through its spirit transmute conditions and characters here and now. It was the first to pray "Thy Kingdom come." But this kingdom, this *'Olam ha-ba* was not beyond the cloud. Its portals were not those of the grave. That world to be which is the vision of Israel's hope and faith is this world of ours reconstituted under the sanctifying reforming sway of justice, righteousness and love. With justice triumphant, righteousness socialized, Judaism hails the advent of the Messianic age when conditions on earth will be such that to no man is denied opportunity to realize his own divinity. Therefore the dominion of religion according to our doctrine is co-extensive with the range of life. Rail out of the plentitude of your prejudices at Talmudic ritualism! That ritualism

is perhaps the caricature but still the expression of the vital truth that nothing in life is indifferent to religion. The most trivial acts are tremendous acts. There is no divide at which the secular parts company from the sacred. Religion must be in all things or it is in nothing. That misintrepreted phrase "My Kingdom is not of this world" as understood by Catholic Christianity and Calvinistic theology, has no place in the dictionary of Judaism.

Judaism as a religion has concern with commerce and industry. It is characteristic of Judaism's realism that on the "tables of the law" doctrine preludes duty. "Thou shalt not steal" was as solemnly thundered forth as "I am the Eternal." This construction of Judaism as ideal realism, as passion for righting the things of this world, as preparation not for death but for the perfect "world to be" the perfect state and social order of the future, is not new. It is the burden of the prophets' censure and caution; it is the content of Pentateuchal legislative provision. The Rabbis express this conviction when they observe that the Torah was not given to the Angels and describe the dramatic reception of Moses in the council-chamber of God when come to claim for earth the Torah. The angels objected. But at the bidding of the Holy One, the son of Amram proves that angels need not the Law; that its commands apply to men and earth alone. How far have they strayed from genuine Judaism who would have the Jewish pulpit be silent on the injustices of earth, the maladjustment of society and under the plea that Temple and Synagogue must be sacred to *religion* would have religion shrink into a contrivance to arouse pleasurable emotions in the worshiper, ecstatic sensuous foregleams of heaven's felici-

ties; into an apothecary's laboratory where patent drugs are concocted for the easing of heart-ache, or opiates are held in readiness for the dulling of grief and pain at the death of dear ones. Religion consoles and eases but only when it stimulates to action when it quickens conscience and directs aright conduct. Remember great Rabbis exposed the iniquity of negro slavery from their pulpits. Remember that our greatest Reform preacher David Einhorn used to say "no politics in religion but by all means religion in politics." Negro slavery has been wiped out, but alas! other and worse slavery still prevails in this world of ours. Shall they who hear the clanking of the chains forego speaking though their old Jewish prayer-book praises God thrice daily for having led His people from bondage to slavery? Widows and orphans are robbed. Does only to the miserable sneak thief that picks our pocket apply "Thou shalt not steal!" and not as solemnly to the shrewd manipulators who have not scrupled to juggle with trust funds, the accumulations of the nation's savings, the sacrifices of heads of families solicitous that their wives and children shall not be left to the cruel mercy of a cold selfish world? Ah, they know not their Judaism who would have it be a conventional badge of spiritual—God save the mark!—respectability. No, Judaism is for this world! Its genius of hopeful realism has syllabled the spiritual message which a people like that of the United States is in need of. Because its kingdom is not beyond the clouds but a vision of justice and freedom realized in the tents of man, Judaism strikes the note that sets vibrating the heart of America similarly attuned to energetic realism, similarly tender to the sufferer from injustice, similarly

hopeful of the future dawn of universal peace and liberty.

Our reform Judaism has come to understand in fullest measure this concordance of its own genius with that of the institutions and the soul of America. We feel that if anywhere on God's footstool our Messionic vision will be made real, it is in this land where a new humanity seems destined to arise. Not to Jerusalem are our eyes turned, but to God! We cannot honestly declare that we are here in exile. We cannot honestly petition that we be led back to Palestine as our country. We have a country which is ours by the right of our being identified with its destinies, our being devoted to its welfare, our sharing its trials, our rejoicing in its triumphs. Two hundred and fifty years has the Jew sojourned in this country. He is not an alien here. His views of liberty and law; of man's inalienable rights and duties hallowed by the sublimities of his religion, are in creative concordance with the distinctive principles pillaring American civilization.

Not an alien, the Jewish American has the right to ask that now when in darkest Europe humanity is outraged, this, his land, remain hospitable to all that would escape from the hell of persecution and intolerance and like the Pilgrim fathers of Puritan faith and the first Jews, the vanguard of the million and two hundred thousand American Jews, would make this land their home. The Jew in America, as we have been told this very morning, has been faithful to his pledges. The community at large was not burdened in consequence of its generous and just policy of the open door. Whatever may come now, we shall assume our responsibility without haggling.

We may claim to have been originators and discov-

erers in one field, that of the philanthropies. But I fear the staff of the leader is about to fall from our hands. We have become wedded too blindly to institutionalism. It is the line of least resistance, I know; but in moral life the line of least resistance is always of evil. Individualization is costly and our local institutions plead for more liberal support. The middle class does its duty. Of those that are below the middle line, in justice nothing can be asked. There are, however, men in this city who through the opportunities offered them in America have come into possession of more than what they or theirs can ever need, who have received as reward for their labor, I grant, large returns from society. They now must remember that they are the stewards of their surplus, not its irresponsible owners. It is for them to place our charities in this city on a sound basis. Is there one of this class who may urge that if he doubles his subscription of $2,000 a year he will suffer want, or his capital be impaired? None of them spends his income, and some of them cannot spend even the interest on their yearly income. To them is addressed the appeal of this day. I have but scant affection for the very rich Jews of New York, and they have no patience with me, I dare say. But whatever arrogance they may display in their dealings with rabbi or minister, they have recognized what they owe to the community. The New York institutions are supported in the main by the richest men. That is the right way. The men of modest means, those that make an honorable living, may and should contribute whatever they can spare, but they are not able to carry the load. It is the clear duty of ten or twelve men in this city to carry the main burden. They need only double their yearly sub-

scriptions. This will ruin none; it will help us all. That should be their way of celebrating this, our memorial hour. Think of what you were when you came here. How much did you have? One of you has told me that his whole assets consisted of a basket of apples, and he had to dispose of them quickly, for one of the stock had begun to rot. That was his beginning. What has been his success after this deal in apples? You would know if I dared mention his name. Yet his experience is typical. Will he claim that if he doubles his subscription to the charities, large in the lump as now it is, that his business will be ruined, his children will have to face want, his grandchildren will be mercilessly exposed to the winter's cruel blasts? Is he not able to repay in this slight way the bounty which American life has placed under his control as the honestly won reward for his honestly performed work? Would it have been possible for him in Europe to rise as he has risen here? Is it not his duty to make the rise of others easier?

We must prepare for the other contingencies that are impending. I personally do not believe that De Witte's promises will be realized. Of course these, my oft expressed misgivings, are due to my not having been invited to kow-tow to De Witte; if I had been taken along I should trumpet to-day a different tune. That is one of the many truthful things circulated about me; let him who wishes, if it affords him pleasure, construe my opinions in this wise. I believe I could have seen the Russian envoy by merely sending him a request for an audience. The Rabbi of Sinai Congregation ceases to be an obscure individual at times and takes on representative character even if he be not at the head of a secret order or a magnate of Wall Street.

I do not believe that the poor premier even if he have the will has the power to redeem his pledge. We must face the sad situation as it is. I myself, an immigrant, and you, the children of immigrants, if not immigrants yourselves, must prepare to receive new thousands of immigrants from Russia, which is a hell, from Roumania, which is an inferno, We must ransom the pledge given by those who settled 250 years ago, that "none of ours shall be a burden on the community." In this awful calamity all American Jewry must band and stand together. It is a duty we owe to Judaism and to America; one of the many obligations in which our Judaism emphasizes what our Americanism tokens; in which our Americanism proves that it is harmoniously attuned to the most profound and most solemn declarations of our Judaism. The flag shall welcome the new pilgrims, and our faith shall make them know that their tottering steps shall be supported and their trembling hands shall be upheld after the terrible afflictions laid on them in the land of their birth, the land of despotic brutality, of dehumanized barbarism.

Great is the joy which may possess our heart. Our escutcheon as Americans is without stain. We have had a share in the making of this nation. In the mine and in the mill, at the lathe and at the loom, in counting room and council chamber the Jew has been at work for two centuries and a half for his America. He has sentried his nation's camp; he has been in the mast's lookout on his nation's ships; he has gone out to battle and he was among them that fell at the firing line. Officer, private, whatever his rank, when the nation asked for life or limb, he did not hesitate to offer the sacrifice. In institutions of learning the Jew has made his mark. In the walks of enterprise his individ-

uality has been felt as a telling potency in the development of the greater aims of American energy. In the professions he stands high; on the bench he has often had representation, of the best and by the best; in the pulpits of the land the Jew has not been in the la t and lowest ranks. In Boston, I believe, these days they will commemorate Garrison's services. This offers an opportunity to dwell once more upon facts often overlooked, and therefore all the more worthy of being pointed out, that in that struggle against slavery none was more eager, none was more enthusiastic than the leader of American Reform Judaism. And in evidence how intensely wedded to liberty is Judaism, his voice found strong support in the pulpit of the most orthodox Portuguese synagogue of Philadelphia. Ready to die, if necessary, among those that spoke against slavery, at risk of life and position, were David Einhorn and Sabbato Morais.

We have earned the right to call this our country. The future will place new solemn obligations upon us for the country's sake and as Judaism's consecration; we shall not shirk our duties. Happy we American Jews that have a country. America is ours. We can sing with all others,

"My country 'tis of thee! sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing;
Land where *my* fathers died, land of *our* Pilgrims' pride."

The watershed separates raindrops and snowflakes to divergent destiny. Race, religion, birth and condition also seem to divide. But on the heights the line of separation is thin; and in duty again all difference

of direction is consecrated to unity of purpose. In our nation no divides but are instrumentalities of service. Clinging to his Judaism, the Jew will be a more strenuous, a more loyal, a more enthusiastic American.

May God bless our country; keep it in His protection. May His light shine out o'er it, and His peace abide and abound in it. This is the prayer of the Jew on this, the Jewish-American anniversary day of joy and solemn resolves. Answer it, God in heaven, in Thy mercy. Amen, Amen!

REFORM JUDAISM AND UNITARIANISM.

AN ADDRESS PREACHED BEFORE SINAI CONGREGATION SUNDAY, DEC. 17, 1905.

BY EMIL G. HIRSCH.

Biblical selection: Jeremiah, xxii.

A distinction without a difference, many contend, is connoted by the two names, Reform Judaism and Unitarianism. And this contention appeals to them with all the greater force since the cry has gone up that it were time to lay stress on the unities and identities of the various religious convictions to the exclusion and obliteration of their variances and discordances. Certainly none of us but would hail with joy the splendor of the noontide when the complete absence of shadow will indicate that the rays of Truth coincide with the absolute perpendicular. But that hour is still far off. Popular as is the monition to forget differences, deeper thought cannot overlook the circumstance that not all distinctions are superficial. Many of the lines of demarcation between the possessions of close neighbors can be ignored only by one ready to sacrifice precious home associations without adequate compensation. Many of the insistences of Judaism which have resulted in keeping the boundary posts in their places are expressive of vital incentives. To abandon them would be tantamount to loss of rich sources of power. We might

do worse than unlearn some of the glib stock phrases of colorless cosmopolitanism. Unity of purpose is not dependent on uniformity of method. Diversity of language makes for wealth of ideas. Humanity speaking but one tongue would be poorer in poetry at all events, even if in the dusty markets of the world haggling for profit might be facilitated. Religion, too, may prophecy of one ultimate truth and still syllable its message in different alphabets. Religions are not the children of accidental caprice. Where their ways part company, historical as often as dogmatic influences have brought about the separation. It is erroneous to hold that because the human heart with its burdens and its joys is the cradle of all religion, all religions are equivalent. In their development, some have attained higher altitudes than others. They have not followed one and the same road, nor tended to the same goal. Some have scaled the heights by paths and under motives peculiarly their own. To point out these differences is not a sin against the holy spirit of liberalism. To search for the underlying meaning of these variations is a duty which intellectual indolence alone will shirk. And if it appears that distinctions denote vital principles, to insist that they be neither blurred nor blotted out is a simple act of justice.

If it were true that no material difference is expressed by the names Judaism and Unitarianism, scant justification would there be for their dividing retention, in view of the possibility of uniting the two bodies in a wider fellowship, under unifying Shibboleth. Liberal though we claim to be, we are not inclined to drop our distinct appellation. Is this mere stubborness on our part? Advantages of a worldly nature certainly are not dependent upon our retaining the designation. The

contrary is most painfully true. Is it idle sentiment that prompts our decision? Granted for argument's sake that sentiment determines our attitude, is it not a fact that sentiment such as this, is known to have been among the most potent forces operative for good in the upward march of humanity's destiny? I for one am ready to bear whatever odium attaches to the disinclination to efface this name of ours. For I know its use is justified by its distinct value as a token for certain vital viewpoints, neglected or rejected in the implications of other names carelessly said to be of identical force with it. I am a Jew and not a Unitarian for very weighty reasons which I cannot ignore.

In saying this I shall omit from the discussion, for the present, the element of birth. Its bearing on the problem in issue will be made clear later on. Were theology the decisive factor, the identity of Judaism and Unitarianism might be postulated. Both teach the Unity of God. Both are anti-trinitarian. But theology is not the supreme index of the character of any religion whatsoever; the doctrines concerning man are always primary. Monotheism is a general term under which a vast variety of creeds are subsumed. Trinitarians are as emphatic in claiming for their systems the monotheistic note as are Unitarians. On the other hand scholars need not be told that in the presentation of the God-idea in the philosophy of Philo and later in the theosophy of the Jewish mystics material modifications of unitarian doctrine have been accorded wide latitude. Would we discover the fundamental divergences, we must pay heed to the teachings concerning the purpose and worth of man's life on earth. The viewpoint of Judaism in this respect is distinct. Its anthropology sets it apart from all other religious constructions of

life's meaning, whatever concordances may superficially be suggested by the verbal formulation of its God-belief and that of other fraternities.

By certain surface indications, the Jew and the Unitarian seem to be assigned to one group. Both were excluded from the church congress convened in the interest of Church Unity a few weeks ago. But in this connection one circumstance is significant. The Jew never dreamt of the possibility of his being invited to participate in the movement. Unitarians accepted their exclusion by no means as a foregone conclusion. They wish to be known as Christians. This insistence on their part upon this name reveals their acceptance of a philosophy of history to which no Jew will subscribe. Of course, for the Unitarian the word Christian carries a connotation altogether other than what it has in the vocabulary of Evangelical and Catholic theologians. For the latter, Christian denotes one who accepts the Christ-ship of Jesus; for the former it implies discipleship to Jesus, the man and teacher. The difference is vital. For the Paulinian dogma, the teachings of Jesus, his life and labors while in this mundane sphere are of slight importance. His death alone is decisive. The Christ is the substituted sacrifice. He is the second Adam appointed to ransom by his blood the children of the first conceived and born in sin, the fatal consequence of their progenitor's disobedience to God's command. The sin of the first Adam brought death into the world; the death and resurrection of the second defeated death. They who accept through faith the Christ, participate in the atonement. They are saved through God's grace which provided in Christ the vicarious lamb. As redeemed through the blood of Christ, they are Chris-

tians. Their religion is the Christ-religion, not because it was founded by Christ but because it is the glad tidings of the Redemption through Christ's death and resurrection. As Edward Everett Hale does not subscribe to this doctrine the Evangelical Church Conference had good warrant for refusing him admission.

But while rejecting the Christ-theology, Christian Unitarians agree with their antipodes in regarding Judaism in the light of a mere and imperfect preliminary. For them, all religious and moral development has culminated in Jesus. Before him, none there was in Judea or elsewhere that even in faint degree approximated him in grasp of spiritual and ethical Truth, as after him no other was needed except to explain what he had taught, Jesus being the highest peak in the mountain range of religious and moral thought and enthusiasm. The Jews to whom first of all dwellers on earth he addressed his words, rejected him incapable of understanding his normal grandeur and of entering into the spirit of his all-inclusive love and all-pardoning pity. He was unique not merely in his own time and nation. He is unique, unparalleled as THE teacher in all time and in all nations. His doctrines are absolute. They are not conditioned by historical circumstance. In fact, this one teacher stands in no organic relation to his age or country. Judaism was neither his mother nor his nurse. His words mean the extinction of Judaism. By his advent, Israel, if ever it had justification for its being, lost the right to existence. Jewish truth was a dim taper the light of which paled to utter quenching the moment this daystar burst forth in sublime and supreme splendor.

It is evident that this Unitarian Christianity declares Judaism to have been a stupid, perhaps a wicked

error, if not before, certainly after, the glorious beginning of the Christian era. All the tears shed by Jewish eyes, all the suffering endured in these nineteen centuries by Jacob's sons have been bootless, fruitless tribute to tribal stubborness and racial arrogance. They were really in retribution of the Jews' refusal to accept the better and brighter truth. The labors of the Jewish scholars were waste of effort. What little gold the Rabbis lifted to the surface had been anticipated in the richer treasures of the New Testament, and could therefore easily have been spared by the family of man. For nearly two millenia Judaism has been sterile obstinacy and the pathos of it all has been the hallucination of Judaism that she was bearing and rearing children sound in body and sane in mind. No one who is a Jew and understands the spirit of Judaism and is acquainted with Jewish literature can subscribe to this verdict. Yet the Jew who lowers his own historical flag to unfurl that of Unitarian Christianity acquiesces in this construction of history. In enrolling himself among the disciples of the Jesus, whom the Christian Unitarians proclaim as the one incomparably great and divinely original teacher with whom no other Prophet or thinker may be associated, the Jew declares his acceptance of the theory that his martyr-forefathers were incompetent to see the truth and by their bigotry and blindness stood in the way of the moral and religious progress of their children and their community.

If the contentions of our Unitarian neighbors were borne out by fact, whatever heart pang might attend the resolution, we should not be slow to form it henceforth to read our own history in the true light and act upon the revelation thus vouchsafed. But unfortunately, the Jesus of the Unitarian dogma is as little the Jesus of

history as is the Christ of Paulinian theology. In maintaining this, we need not invoke the aid of the modern philosophy of evolution and ask its pronouncements on the assumption that the teachings of Jesus are in no way organically linked to the life and thought of the age in which they took on first articulation. Let the concession be made that genius always is independent of time and locality. The question remains, do what is known as the sayings of Jesus bear out the claim of their absolute originality? Here again let the widest concessions be made. Let us forget all we have learned of the higher criticism which would warrant the statement that very little of the New Testament story is authentic and no certainty may be cherished that the utterances ascribed to the "Master" fell from his lips. We shall accept the gospels as co-temporaneous biographies and the parables and sayings as stenographic reports. In no wise do the contents of the evangels corroborate the position that Jesus was one of the creative minds who are born free children of eternity and the universe and therefore untethered to time and locality. There is not one syllable in his teachings that will vindicate his superior originality in contrast to and conflict with the doctrines of the Synagogue of his day. When Geiger made this statement four decades ago, many among the liberal Protestant theologians with considerable passion attempted to refute it. They have not succeeded in justifying their own contrary insistences. Though to the present day, Harnack and Bousset and men of minor equipment continue to ignore the testimony of Jewish literature, scholars at home in this field can harbor no doubt on the correctness of Geiger's judgment. In method and thought, Jesus is a Jewish haggadist. No new truth

was winged by him. His theology is Jewish. His ethics is as little absolute as that of any other teacher. Many of the positions advanced are unintelligible save to one who is familiar with the peculiar vocabulary and expectations of the Messianism of the declining decades of the second Temple. His style has often been lauded as unique. Jewish students have not been slow to recognize the beauty and force of his diction. Yet the English poet who in recent weeks has discussed the unique poetic quality of Jesus' similes and descriptive powers has still to learn that almost every element which he adduces is indigenous to the Jewish Midrash and is of usual occurrence in the picture language of the Rabbinical homilies. The Jew thus has no reason for abandoning his own literature in exchange for the New Testament. In his own books he can find inspiratio as rich and as pure as in the gospels.

Nor is it true that Judaism played no vital part in the moral and religious destiny of the world after the "fulfillment in Jesus." If the ethics of the gospels are final, as the Christian Unitarians insist they are, the Jews in sober truth have good cause to argue that but for them these ethics would never have been actualized. It was the Jew who literally offered the left cheek to be smitten while the right still tingled with the unjust blow. In dealing with him, the "Christian" world demanded an eye for an eye and life for life. Imputing to him a murder which neither he nor his fathers had committed, his tormentors exacted from him millionfold requitement of blood. It seems then that even while the years numbering the glad times of salvation were chronicling the happenings, on our planet the Jews were performing the function of missionaries illustrating by their lives of suffering the

implications of these "absolute ethics." This, however, is but one aspect of the service rendered by the Jew after the birth of Jesus.

The Jew is the barometer of civilization. Altitudes may be read by the telltale figures on the barometer's graduated scale. The Jew indicates the height attained by civilization. The pressure that is upon him reveals the state of the atmosphere surrounding his neighbors. The Jew is a constant appeal to the conscience of the world. He is a reproach to all that pretend to live the true life and do not. That love and good will were not the dominant motives of the Christianity of the dark ages is amply demonstrated by the lot of the Jews in those days. But what about our age? Desertion of Judaism for Unitarian monotheism would imply that there is no further call for the historical unmasker of the world's immoral pretense. Is there not? Let the last three decades of rampant materialism, of mad nationalism, of rabid anti-Semitism answer! Everyone born of a Jewish mother is appointed to the duty which is the Jew's, to be the barometer of civilization. Call this mystery or what you will. It is a fact accentuated even in the reception accorded the apostate by them whose ranks he joins. It is a fact emphasized by the moral suspicions with which the world judges the motives prompting the decision of the Jewish renegade. The Jew who would affiliate with Christian Unitarians will not have to accept a new thology. But while assenting to the view discussed before according to which Judaism was poorer in moral inspiration than the religion of Jesus, the Jewish neophyte in addition exposes himself to the just distrust that the desire to escape the obligations which came to him in the hour of his birth has in-

fluenced his act. Moral cowards certainly lack consecration. They are sorry exponents of religious and ethical truths. One who casts stones on the grave of his father is not merely not advanced to higher outlooks than Judaism vouchsafes, he is infinitely below the spiritual and moral level of his mother's religion.

All this is said in no narrow spirit. By all means let us be broad. But has Unitarian ever dreamt of joining Judaism? Here is the rub! To accept our name would imply rejecting the prejudice of two thousand years, that interpretation of history according to which Jesus originated even in Palestine entirely new religious and moral teachings. Names are not unimportant. Labels are not always libels. Jacob in the legend will not permit his assailant to depart ere he have been blessed by him. And that blessing was conveyed in the tormentor hailing him as Israel, "champion of God." As long as Jew is construed to imply arrested moral or religious growth, poverty or inferiority in humane incentives, no Jew can acquiesce in labeling Judaism by any other name. The moral principle of the "Kampf ums Recht" is involved in this. Unitarianism proclaiming the leadership of Jesus, is Judaism, if it is really accepting the religion of the "Master." Why not acknowledge this? Judaism nurtured Jesus. In no respect did his teachings transcend Judaism. He was neither more universalistic nor less nationalistic than the synagogue of his day. If union there shall be of these two regiments marching under different banners tokening identity, why not adopt as the common appellation the older name? Probably the historic associations of their names are rich sources of inspiration to our neighbors. But so are ours to us. We perpetuate an injustice upon the memory

of our fathers and abandon our clear right to originality and priority if we haul down our flag. As long as even Unitarians are loath to bless us as "the fighters for truth" we shall not entertain the suggestion to obliterate the line of division. It stands for a principle, not for a caprice.

But after all we do *not* agree in fundamentals. Religion for the Jew means something altogether different from what it signifies to the monotheistic non-Jew. In the first place, death and immortality are in no sense focal in the religion of the Jew. Life is. This important feature has of late been somewhat blurred. Into our synagogues has intruded a notion of religion as concerned with dying which is altogether unsupported by the testimony of Judaism given in Jewish literature. Our Bible maintains a significant silence on immortality. What will happen to us after we shall have been freed from the fetters of our mortality, no Jew ever ventured to predict in precise detail. Talmudic speculation, while more prolific than was the Bible on this point is far from dogmatic inflexibility. And in the Talmudic elaboration of religion scant recognition was given to the doctrine of immortality. For whatever may be in store for us, this is the certainty cherished by the Jew, that the beyond shall be neither a magnet nor a deterent. This life worthily lived is the best prelude to whatever may await us in the hereafter. Orthodox Jew, and Radical Jew, in fact, whosoever is a Jewish Jew, is not prompted by the thought of immortality, to seek God's altars. His religion certainly is not a scheme to open to him the gates of heaven. It is not a plan to buy him immunity from the punishment that is prepared for the sinner. Like death, so is sin not the dominant preoccupation of Judaism. Chris-

tianity, however, is the religion of other-worldliness. This life is really an affliction, a burden. The life to be is the true destiny of man. It is the first and the final solicitude that urges man to become and be religious. Religion is the guide to the beyond; it profers the assurance of salvation; even in the eyes of the non-dogmatic Christian, the main function of religion is to console; its purpose is to fill the heart with sweet confidence in the promises of life eternal; it predicts that the contrasts and conflicts of this life shall be harmonized in the beyond; that injustice done here will be requited there; the first shall be last, and the last shall be first. Other-worldliness is the obsession of the religionist in all religions save sound and sane Judaism.

In the second place, Judaism not being a religion of salvation; and therefore its preoccupation being centered in this life, its passion is for righteousness here on earth. "Do not weep," says the Prophet, "for them that die," but weep for them that must leave their country. Foreseeing a great national catastrophe Jeremiah calls for tears over the unrighteousness of kings and courtiers that have brought upon the people the calamity. Death is natural. It is no evil. But he utters his "Woe unto them that build their houses, but not with righteousness;" that live in palaces while they hold the poor in contempt; that spread the foundation of their wealth on the spoliation of the weaker members of society. Religious righteousness as a social potency the Jewish prophet pleads for; it is social unrighteousness against which he protests. Not individual salvation, but social adjustment of the basis of equity, is the sacramental insistence of Judaism, the one religion that would inspirit every act and thought with reverence for God as the One creator whose breath

animates mortal clay and who made man in His image.

On the premises of Paulinian theology and dogmatics other-worldliness is both logical and inevitable. If all is contaminated by sin, if the curse is upon this world, one who has least concern in this world is freest from the contagion of sin and is safest from being dominated by the spirit of sinfulness. Hence less of the world means more of glory to come. But if this world is not under sin, preoccupation with this world's affairs cannot be construed to be sinful. And yet so strongly has the dogmatic position of Christianity influenced its own dogmatic modifications that even by these somehow or other the affairs of this world are held to be secondary.

Other-worldliness is reintroduced under the new name spirituality. Religion is construed to bring about a union in the spirit of God and man; a mystic merging of the individual soul in the All-soul. Exaltation and emotion are welcomed as symptoms of the spiritual regeneration. Religion is reduced to an attitude rather than an unbroken series of consecrated activities. It is something that is added to life rather than a force pervading all life. An element of unreality is introduced. The senses are looked upon with suspicion. The body is held to be of evil. Nature is synonymous with unholiness. The natural healthy life is put under the ban. Resignation, quietism, not assertion and resistance are urged as sacred moods. Ambition is sinful. Altruism is posited as contrary to egoism. Self-effacement is declared the prerequisite to sanctified spirituality.

The Jewish mind has but little in common with this spirituality. The Jew is urged to develop self in order that in the service of others he may do more. In this

dust woven body of his, his spirituality shall find its instrument. Reality shall be made to conform with ideality. Activity, not meditation, is the resultant disposition. The Jewish religion is not something added to life but is part of life itself. Strength, not sweetness is its gift. Duty, not exaltation, is its expression.

Much of the non-dogmatic Christianity I know is saturated with this other-worldliness. Its sympathies are noble but ineffective. It dreams of a perfect world but forgets to battle for the perfection of the world. It prays and worships. It analyzes moods, not motives, and is introspective. It lacks virility. It is graceful but timid. It lives in the clouds beyond the dust of this earth. Judaism is always beyond thedluaordlu this earth. Judaism is always virile or it is not Jewish. Prayer and worship are means not ends. Faith must be a flame that warms, not a pale light that betrays somewhere a star. With this non-dogmatic religion of spirituality we have nothing in common.

It were unpardonable not to acknowledge that in the Western States Unitarianism, like Judaism, has developed along freer lines. Character and conduct, not dogma or sentiment, are the cardinal intentions of religion according to the declaration of the Western conference. Here it would seem the opportunity was offered for a closer fellowship between this ethical Unitarianism and our own Judaism. But again this difference comes to light. Our ethical Judaism is not the result of modifications of Judaism. We had to relinquish no dogma. The ethics of the prophets have always been the inspiration of Judaism. Even orthodox Judaism is under the consecration of ethical passion. The line of division between orthodoxy and radicalism in Judaism does not coincide with that between dogma

and deed. Our liberal friends will not understand that we have not been influenced by modern theories but have simply asked Isaiah and Amos and Hoseah to speak to us. We have become more Jewish when we eliminated old symbols. In our relations with non-Jewish liberalism we must emphasize our Jewishness all the more since even their greatest teachers like those of the Christian wing refuse to accord to Judaism its due. In accentuating the positive ethical ambition of religion as an energy to build up character and reform society according to the insistences of justice, liberalism has simply reverted to prophetic Judaism. The Jew has no justification for abandoning Judaism on the plea that service to man calls him to the front. That service has always been the sacramental obligation of his religion.

We rejoice in the good work at all times sponsored by liberal Unitarianism. We do not forget that every noble cause for the betterment of social conditions had among its prophets men and women of the Unitarian fraternity. To enlist under the banner of social service, no Jew is required to abjure his Judaism. Quite to the contrary, his Judaism will inspire him to be loyal to this flag. In following it, he will obey the prophets' call. To battle for God and man is Israel's historic duty. The bond of union between us and others of similar consecration need not necessitate the obliterating of traditional associations. We shall not and we cannot even by implication concede that the centuries of our dispersion were a fatal waste of energy. Until this world is willing to bless Jacob, his descendants cannot resign their birthright. The distinction between Judaism and Unitarianism is *not* without a difference.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 069 347 3